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ABSTRACT

The main focus in this thesis is the understanding of Genesis 12: 1- 13: 4 and its development in the Genesis Apocryphon, one of the re-written Bible texts, dealt with in this dissertation. Reading the Genesis Apocryphon, it draws your attention to firstly find out why, and secondly, to see how the author/s of this scroll re-wrote the above-mentioned passage in Genesis.

The focus of the Genesis- account is particularly on Abram leaving the Promised Land for Egypt, and consequently, what may be regarded as his ill behaviour towards Sarai, his wife, while they were in Egypt. Abram’s leave-taking of the Promised Land, and his behaviour towards his wife are unexpected, for Abram had followed God’s calling, and had been promised Canaan for his and Sarai’s offspring. However, God interferes, and leads Abram back on his steps.

During my study I came to the conclusion that the way in which scholars have explained the Genesis Apocryphon up to now, is disputable. Scholars usually overlook the function of the first person singular in the narrative of the Genesis Apocryphon. The author has tried to hoodwink audiences by purposefully writing the narrative in Abram’s name. Consequently, the Adventure in Egypt is presented through the eyes of Abram, who wants to whitewash his own reputation. However, in some instances the author gives a glimpse of the real course of events. This can be seen in column XIX: 23 where it is said that Abram and Sarai lived peacefully in Egypt for five years, in contrast to what the readers would expect after Abram’s alarming dream and interpretation in the preceding paragraphs. Moreover, column XX: 9- 10 reads: “Sarai said to the king, ‘He’s my brother’, while I was negotiating
(חרים והปาתי מתאר) about what concerned her". The order of the mentioned activities suggests that Sarai first said to the king that Abram was her brother, after which Abram could start his negotiations with Pharaoh. Yet, the periphrastic construction יִנְדָּה בֶּן in combination with בֶּן יָהַה indicates that Abram first started the negotiations about Sarai, and consequently forced her to confirm that he was her brother. Reading the narrative in the way I propose, Abram is depicted as a human person, who makes grave mistakes. He is presented as somebody who abandons his calling. Consequently, he does not become the person he was destined to be, and harms the woman closest to him. This harmful behaviour has the effect of a stone thrown into water; it spreads in circles around him. As a result, even Pharaoh's court is affected. However, God, who is merciful, leads him back to his calling.

The scroll was probably written for Jews in the first century B.C.E., who abandoned their calling, due to the attraction of Hellenism with its material advantages. The author wants to indicate that it is best to return to God and to Judaism. If people abandon their calling, this will bring harm, not only to the people nearest to them, but also to others. However, just as God was merciful to the ancestor Abram, and led him back to his destination, He will be merciful to his descendants, when they go astray, and lead them back to their destination.

Therefore, my study results in a new interpretation of the Genesis Apocryphon, which is not contradictory to the account in Genesis, but which elaborates it so extensively, that the narrative is changed a great deal. This interpretation of the Genesis Apocryphon is the result of a literary analysis, which enables a further penetration into the insights of the narratives, given its synchronic character.
Another contribution of this dissertation is my interpretation of the passage in *Jubilees*, and in *Jewish Antiquities* by Flavius Josephus. A comparison of the three re-written Bible-texts gives a better impression of the particular approach in the *Genesis Apocryphon*, which contains an unequalled depiction of Abram. Abram is not presented as a great ancestor, worthy of imitation. On the contrary, he is a person, who makes grave mistakes, but God helps him overcome them, and puts him back on the right track.

In *Jubilees* the Adventure in Egypt does not have the concentric structure, which it has in *Genesis* and in the *Genesis Apocryphon*. In *Jubilees* the passage is not a narrative on its own, but it forms part of Abram’s wanderings with God. The author of *Jubilees* elaborates greatly on Abram’s process of learning to know God. The better he knows God, the more he adheres to Him. At the moment of famine, which induces Abram to travel to Egypt, Abram’s relationship with God has become so intimate that this journey to Egypt simply cannot indicate that he turns his back on God. It merely functions as proof of God’s power, of God’s faithfulness, and of his good relationship with Abram.

In *Jewish Antiquities* Abram never had the intention of staying in Egypt. He left Canaan only to escape the famine. During his stay in Egypt he took the opportunity to learn to know the Egyptian religion and wisdom. However, both the Egyptian religion and wisdom proved to be inferior to his, with the result that the Egyptians learnt from him. The arithmetic and the astronomy, which Abram taught the Egyptians, were passed on to the Greeks. Consequently, Abram’s sojourn in Egypt indicates the superiority of Judaism to the religion of the Egyptians, and it shows that Abram’s knowledge even forms the basis of Greek learnedness. Hence, *Jewish Antiquities* is clearly an apology.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABSTRACT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE – A BRIEF HISTORY OF RESEARCH OF THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS WITH SPECIAL ATTENTION TO THE GENESIS APOCRYPHON

1.1. Introduction

1.1.1. Motivation and Aim

1.1.2. The Importance of this Dissertation

1.2. The Finds

1.2.1. The Caves

1.2.2. The Manuscripts

1.2.2.1. The Manuscripts of Cave 1

1.2.2.2. Dating the Manuscripts

1.2.3. A Survey of the Manuscripts

1.3. The Genesis Apocryphon

1.3.1. The State of the Opened Scroll
1.3.2. Further Publications on the *Genesis Apocryphon* 18-22
1.3.3. The Genre and Name of the Scroll 22-25
1.3.4. The Date of 1QapGen 25-26
1.3.5. The Date of the Narrative 26-28
1.3.6. The Text 29

CHAPTER TWO – AN ANALYSIS OF *GENESIS* 12: 1-13: 4 30-81

2.1. A General Scheme of *Genesis* 36-37

2.1.1. A Fixed Point of Orientation 37-39


2.2.2. Translation of *Genesis* 12: 1-13: 4 41-43

2.2.3. Notes 43-57

2.3. A Reading of *Genesis* 12: 1-13: 4 57-57

2.4. The Major Motives in the Text 67-73

2.4.1. Three Generations and the Famine 69

2.4.2. The Question of Abram's Behaviour 70-73

Column XIX 89-91

Column XX 91-94

Column XXI 95
2.5. *Genesis* 12: 8-13: 4 as a Concentric Narrative 73-77

2.6. The Relationship between God and Abraham 78-79

2.7. The Message of the Text 80

Inventory of the Problems in the Pericope 80-81

CHAPTER THREE – A COMMENTARY ON THE *GENESIS APOCRYPHON* XIX: 7-XXI: 4 82-219

3.1. The Place of the Pericope in the Last Four Columns 83-84

3.2. The Text of *Genesis Apocryphon* XIX: 7-XXI: 4 84-88

3.3. The translation of *Genesis Apocryphon* XIX: 7-XXI: 4 89-95

3.4. An Outline of the Pericope 95-98

3.5. Text-critical and Philological Notes on 1QapGen XIX: 7-XXI: 4 99-178

  Column XIX 99-128

  Column XX 129-172

  Column XXI 173-178

3.6. The Structure of 1QapGen XIX: 7 till XXI: 4 179-182

3.7. Analysis of the Narrative 182-214
3.8. Conclusion 214- 218

3.9. The Purpose of the Narrative 218- 219

CHAPTER FOUR – THE COMPARISON OF THE PERICOPE IN THE GENESIS APOCRYPHON AND IN GENESIS. 220- 267


4.2. Hellenistic Influences on 1QapGen 242- 247

4.2.1. The First Person 248- 255

4.3. Hermeneutic Methods in 1QapGen 255- 258

4.4. Methods in Rewritten Bible Texts to Improve the Biblical Text 258- 261

4.5. Non- Constructive Harmonisation 261- 263

4.6. Conclusion 263- 267

CHAPTER FIVE – THE HEIGHT OF THE GENESIS APOCRYPHON 268- 275

5.1. The Poetics of Genesis 268- 270

5.2. The Genesis Apocryphon 270- 273

5.3. An Analysis 273- 275

CHAPTER SIX – A COMPARISON OF HERMENEUTIC PRINCIPLES IN 1QAPGEN AND IN THE BOOK OF JUBILEES 276- 322
6.1. *Jubilees*

6.1.1. Purpose and Character of *Jubilees*  
278- 283

6.1.2. The Author  
278- 280

6.1.3. Date and Place of *Jubilees* (S.i.L.)  
281

6.1.4. The Egyptian Adventure in *Jubilees*  
281- 282

6.1.5. The Egyptian Adventure in *Jubilees*  
282- 283

6.2. A Comparison of the Contexts of *Jubilees* and the *Genesis*

*Apocryphon* prior to the Egyptian Adventure  
283- 306

6.2.1. Abram in *Jubilees*  
283- 296

6.2.2. The Egyptian Adventure  
297- 304

6.2.3. The Brevity of the Egyptian Adventure in *Jubilees*  
304- 306

**Analysis of *Jubilees***

6.3.1. The Absence of a Concentric Shape  
306- 315

6.3.2. Abram's Character in *Jubilees*  
306- 308

6.3.3. The Presentation of the Egyptian Adventure in the Three Versions  
308- 309

6.3.4. The Dependence of the *Genesis Apocryphon* from *Jubilees*  
309- 311

6.3.5. 1QapGen's Presentation of Abram  
311

6.3.6. The *Apocryphon's* Indebtedness to *Jubilees*  
311- 315

6.3.7. Conclusion Concerning *Jubilees*  
315

6.4. The Pericope in *Jewish Antiquities*  
315- 320

6.4.1. Conclusion concerning *Antiquities*  
320- 322

7. CONCLUSION OF THIS DISSERTATION  
323
7.1. The Date xiii
7.2. The Author(s) 323
7.3. The origins of the Community and the Scrolls 323-324
7.4. The purpose of the Narrative 325-326
7.5. The Genre of the *Genesis Apocryphon* 326-327
7.6. The Compilation of the Narrative 327
7.7. The Function of the Structure of the Narrative in 1QapGen 327-328
7.8. The Theological Question of Abram's Descent to Egypt 329
7.9. The *Genesis Apocryphon* Today 329-331

**APPENDIX A** 331-332

**APPENDIX B** 333-334

**APPENDIX C** 335-339

**APPENDIX D** 340-343

**BIBLIOGRAPHY** 344-345
CHAPTER ONE - A BRIEF HISTORY OF RESEARCH OF THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS WITH SPECIAL ATTENTION TO THE GENESIS APOCRYPHON.

1.1. Introduction

1.1.1. Motivation and Aim

This dissertation derives from interest in and research into the inter-testamentary period. During my theological studies at the Free University in Amsterdam, the Netherlands, I was especially interested in Biblical Studies and the Relationship between Judaism and Christianity. Hence, my main subject was Judaica, for which I had to continue studying Semitic languages. My thesis for the degree of doctorandus theologiae dealt with the view of the Tannaim and Amoraim on proselytes.

Once in South Africa, my focus shifted from the study of Judaism in a wider sense, to Judaism of the inter-testamentary period. This was partly the result of my activities as a lecturer of New Testament at the University of the Western Cape in Bellville, and the Moravian Theological Centre at Heideveld.

The present dissertation fits into my field of interest. I could use and extend the acquired knowledge of languages, hermeneutics, and history of the inter-testamentary period. The Genesis Apocryphon is especially very interesting, because not much has been published about this scroll due to its deteriorated state. Moreover, it is a rewritten Bible account, which follows Genesis, but which also differs in important instances, e.g. by the use of Hellenistic devices. This
hermeneutic perspective has captured my academic interest.

It has been my aim to do research into the development of ideas in the pericope of *Genesis Apocryphon* XIX: 7- XXI: 4 in comparison with *Genesis* 12: 1- 13: 4. I find it most stimulating to compare the "adventures" of Abram in Egypt in both books. Why, I asked myself, has the story been rewritten, and how? These questions are the focus of my present dissertation.

The research is done in terms of the given texts. Hence, my emphasis lies on the *synchronic* study of the texts. The synchronic approach has been chosen as it "invites" by its nature to do a literary analysis of the given texts; a situation which enables me to look further at the structure of the narratives and their final phrasing.

In order to achieve insight into how the Egyptian Adventure is related in other books belonging to the rewritten Bible genre, I have also done research into the *Book of Jubilees* by Charles and VanderKam, and in *Jewish Antiquities* of Flavius Josephus. Yet, my focus is synchronic, that is, my interest lies in the given books, in the ideas as they are presented in *Genesis*, on the one hand, and in the *Genesis Apocryphon*, on the other.

Above, I referred to the bad state in which the scroll of the *Genesis Apocryphon* was retrieved. Professor Elisha Qimron of the University of the Negev in Beer Sheva is presently busy finalising the second edition of the *Genesis Apocryphon*. The first edition by Avigad and Yadin (published in 1956) was only preliminary, due to the fact that many passages could not be deciphered. Qimron uses a new technique, called imaging spectometry, which has helped a great deal to bring to
light previously unreadable passages. Noticably, his new findings are not applicable to the columns, which I use in this study, because the pericope of my study has been preserved rather well.

1.1.2. The Importance of this Dissertation

The pivot of this dissertation is the theological problem of Abram descending to Egypt in the light of the biblical book of \textit{Genesis}. He had followed God’s call, and was promised a land and progeny as a result. Nonetheless, when a famine occurred, he left the Promised Land to sojourn in Egypt. The \textit{Genesis} account indicates that Abram made up his mind to move to Egypt, and as a result he presented his wife Sarai as his sister, rather than as his official wife, to save his own life in Egypt. This attitude might be seen as morally problematic.

During my research I have found, that the \textit{Genesis Apocryphon} has a deeper meaning, which depicts Abram as someone who abandons God and his promises, even in a stronger way than in \textit{Genesis}. By his choice, in favour of material things, Abram becomes a ruthless person. However, God intervenes, restores justice, and leads Abram back to Canaan, where he has to submit himself to God and His ethics. I intend to show that the \textit{Genesis Apocryphon} was written for Jews, attracted to Hellenism during the first century B.C.E. That is, the scroll seeks to show what happens to the select believer Abram, when he abandons God’s call, and goes out of the Land of Canaan. This was probably the reason why the scroll was not too popular in Qumran (only one copy of the \textit{Genesis Apocryphon} was found there); it was meant for Hellenised Jews, to convince them to observe the commandments.

The \textit{Genesis Apocryphon} strengthens a point that is maybe implicit in \textit{Genesis}, but not explicit. I seek to show that the arrangement of the verse,
in *Genesis* 12: 10 is not accidental. It indicates that the episode of going to Egypt is immoral after the call to Abram to go to the Land, and Abram’s subsequent obedience. Implicitly, it alludes to a problem in Abram’s behaviour. In my analysis, the *Genesis Apocryphon* is elaborating on this topic. Hence, I am arguing in my dissertation that the author of the *Genesis Apocryphon* took it very seriously that Abram went to Egypt at this stage. My dissertation develops this issue, and its design structure leads to this conclusion.

This reading of the *Genesis Apocryphon* is also important given the intention of *Jubilees*. The author introduces Abram as a person whose relationship with God is growing. At the time of the famine this relationship is so good, that there is no suspicion that Abram might want to leave the Promised Land for good. He leaves it due to the famine, but with God on his side. In fact, Abram’s journey to Egypt functions in *Jubilees* as proof of God’s faithfulness. Seven years after Abram has prayed to Him never to forsake him, God saves him and Sarai from the power of Pharaoh. The journey is not problematic as in *Genesis*. According to *Jubilees*, the relationship between God and Abram is harmonious. Abram functions as one of the great ancestors of old, worthy of imitation. The *Jubilees* narrative dates back to the second century B.C.E., a period when Hellenism had not yet rooted deeply in the Jewish society, with the result that an *Auseinandersetzung* of the kind of the *Genesis Apocryphon* was not necessary.

In *Jewish Antiquities* Abram takes the initiative to journey to Egypt when a famine occurs in Canaan, and when he learns that there is abundant food in Egypt. However, he never had the intention of staying there. In fact, his sojourn in Egypt functions as proof of the superiority of Judaism to the religion of the Egyptians, and as proof that Abram’s knowledge forms the basis of Greek learnedness.
Antiquities is clearly an apology.

This dissertation provides a literary analysis of the Genesis Apocryphon, which enables a further penetration into the insights of the narratives. This sort of literary analysis has been enabled given the synchronic nature of the work, an approach, which stimulates a literary analysis.

1.2. The Finds

In the winter of 1946-1947 Ta'amireh shepherds—who were grazing their goats on the mountains west of the Dead Sea, about eight miles south of Jericho—found jars in a cave (Vermes 1994a: 1). In some of those jars there were scrolls, which proved to be of utmost importance for the study of both Judaism and Christianity. After captain P. Lippens of the United Nations in 1949 had located the site where the scrolls were found, a real race for more caves and more scrolls developed between the Bedouins and the scholars, which lasted from 1951 till 1956. For the Ta’amireh this was a good opportunity to make a living (VanderKam 1994: 11, and Cross 1995: 27-36), to the scholars it was of utmost importance that the caves remain undisturbed, to enable them to do proper scientific research. The scholars’ search was also impeded by the political situation in the region at that time.

In the end the Ta’amireh were the people who found the most important caves, i.e. caves 1, 2, 4, 6 and 11, and the scholars found caves 3, 5 and 7 up till 10. The numbers refer to the chronological order in which they were found.

De Vaux (of the École Biblique et Archéologique Française in Jerusalem, and editor in chief of the international scroll team, see Shanks 1993: 276) and Harding (the director of Jordan’s Department of Antiquities, Shanks 1993: 262) excavated Cave 1. Later, De Vaux was given the responsibility for further excavations. These
took place in the caves of Wadi Qumran, Wadi Murabba’at, Khirbet Qumran and Khirbet Feshkha. These excavations were done during five seasons from 1951 up till 1956. Preliminary publications about them were made in the *Revue Biblique* (e.g. De Vaux 1953: 83-106). In 1961 De Vaux published his Schweich Lectures, held at the British Academy in London in 1959 under the title *L'archéologie et les manuscrits de la Mer Morte*. In 1973 a thorough revision of this book named *Archeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, made by De Vaux himself, was published posthumously. In the preface to this book De Vaux makes a clear distinction between the various excavations he had done.

Those in the caves of Murabba’at and in other caves further to the south in the desert of Judaea "were essentially connected with the Second Jewish Revolt", while those at Khirbet Mird to the west of Qumran "relate to the Christian and Arab epochs" (De Vaux 1973: IX). I will deal with the scrolls found in the vicinity of Qumran only.

After this introduction I will shed more light on:

a) The caves, and especially the manuscripts which were retrieved from them, and

b) Khirbet Qumran, its various strata of inhabitation, its relationship with the caves, 'Ein Feshkha and 'Ein el-Ghuweir.

### 1.2.1. The Caves

In 1952, 270 caves, crevices and holes were examined. Twenty-six of these contained pottery identical to that of Cave 1 (De Vaux 1973: 50-51). In caves 3, 5 and 7 up till 10, the archaeologists discovered fragments of texts of the same type as the texts sold by the Ta'amireh. This shows that the Bedouin had not planted the manuscripts in the caves (De Vaux 1973: 95-97).
Another matter of interest to the archaeologists was the condition in which the scrolls had been found in the caves. The Bedouin had reported to a member of the Assyrian Community in Jerusalem, that the contents of the jars had a very strong smell when they opened them. Hence, the Bedouin tore the wrappings from the scrolls and threw them away. Sukenik, indeed, saw some threads from the wrappers on a scroll, which was later identified as a part of the *Book of Isaiah* (Crowfoot 1955: 18-19).

Furthermore, the archaeologists themselves found a manuscript fragment in cave 1, which was attached to a piece of its linen wrapper and to the neck of a jar (Harding 1955: 7; Crowfoot 1955: 18). This led to the conclusion that there was a relationship between the scrolls, the linen, and the pottery. The pottery in the "more than thirty caves extending over an area of several square kilometres" (De Vaux 1973: 54) around Khirbet Qumran could be dated back to the first centuries B.C.E. and C.E. Since the same kind of pottery had been found in the ruins of Qumran, and since the occupation of the caves and the ruins took place in the first century B.C.E. and C.E., and because the caves are all situated in the vicinity of Qumran, there should be a link between the caves and the ruins. Moreover, the documents probably belonged to the people who lived in Khirbet Qumran. However, the occasion which compelled the manuscripts to be deposited in the caves seemed different. In Cave 1 the manuscripts had been stored in closed jars. In other caves they had been piled up as if they had been abandoned hurriedly. Cave 4 gave the impression of a library in severe decay (Schiffman 1995: 29-30; Cross 1997: 58).
1.2.2. The Manuscripts

The retrieved manuscripts were mostly written on parchment on which lines were drawn to facilitate a neat handwriting. Some manuscripts were on papyrus, and one was on copper.

The international scroll-team that worked in Jerusalem designed a system of reference for the scrolls (Fitzmyer 1990: XV). They indicated each scroll by means of a siglum. A siglum may consist of five elements:

1) The material on which the text is written,
2) Its provenience,
3) The title of the work,
4) The copy of it at the given place,
5) Its language.

Thus, the Genesis Apocryphon is: 1QapGen (Fitzmyer 1990: 3-5)¹.

1.2.2.1. The Manuscripts of Cave 1

The seven manuscripts, found by the Bedouins in the winter of 1946-1947, and sold to dealers in antiquities, were the following:

- A scroll describing the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness
- A scroll of Thanksgiving Psalms
- An incomplete manuscript of Isaiah in Hebrew (1QIsaᵃ)
- A complete manuscript of Isaiah in Hebrew (QIsaᵇ)
- The Manual of Discipline (later re-named Community Rule)
- A pesher (commentary) on Habakkuk.
- The Genesis Apocryphon.

¹ Henceforward the Genesis Apocryphon will also be denoted Apocryphon.
The first three scrolls were sold to Sukenik of the Hebrew University (Cross 1995: 21-22). Sukenik, who was a professor in Jewish Archaeology at the Hebrew University, recognised the palaeo-Hebrew script on the scrolls, and realised immediately their importance. Sukenik published two preliminary surveys, in Hebrew, in *Hidden Scrolls from the Judaean Desert* (1948-1949). Sukenik’s conclusion that the manuscripts belonged to the Essenes has become widespread amongst scholars ever since (1955: 29).

However, other opinions have been proclaimed by Schiffman, Golb, the husband and wife team of Donceel and Donceel-Voûte, and Crown and Cansdale. Schiffman thinks that the *yachad* of Qumran consisted of some of the Sadducees unwilling to co-operate with the Hasmonean rulers, when the latter had taken control over the Temple in Jerusalem (1993: 41). On the other hand, Golb maintains that the khirbeh of Qumran was one of the fortresses built by the Hasmoneans, which was in the hands of the Jews till 70 C.E. (1994: 72). Furthermore, he holds that the books in the caves originate in the various libraries of Jerusalem, and were hidden in the caves before an imminent Roman attack during the First Jewish Revolt (1989: 177-207). The Donceel couple hold that Khirbet Qumran contained a residential area with a *triclinium* on the upper floor (instead of a *scriptorium*, 1994: 1-32, esp. 22 and 27-31); Crown and Cansdale consider Qumran a commercial entrepôt and a resting stop for travellers (1994: 26).

In this dissertation the opinion is held that a community lived in Qumran, which held ideas similar to those of the Essenes. Whether this community had a *scriptorium* is doubtful, but there was certainly scribal activity as the retrieved inkwells show (Donceel and Donceel-Voûte 1994: 31, Goranson 1994: 39).
The other four scrolls were sold to Mar Athanasius Yeshue Samuel, the Syrian metropolitan of St. Mark's Monastery in Jerusalem. He allowed the staff members of the American School for Oriental Research in Jerusalem to study the four scrolls, and to prepare three of them for publication. Those three scrolls were:

- 1QIsa
- A commentary on Habakkuk
- The Manual of Discipline.

They were published in: Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery* I and II (For a reprint see Cross et al. 1974). The fourth scroll, which was in an advanced state of decay, was published by Avigad and Yadin under the name *A Genesis Apocryphon*.

In 1951, after the splitting of British Mandatory Palestine into Israel and Jordan (1948), Barthélemy and Milik, members of the international scroll team of the *Ecole biblique et archéologique française*, were commissioned to edit the fragments collected in Cave 1 (Vermes 1994a: 2). This resulted in the publication of the first volume in the series *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert (DJD)* (Barthélemy and Milik, 1955). Recent information on the Dead Sea Scrolls can be obtained from the titles mentioned in Appendix A.

After a very speedy publication of the first scrolls, the process of publication grew slower and slower, due to several reasons. At last, in 1990, Emanuel Tov, professor of biblical studies at the Hebrew University, was appointed chief-editor

---

² Originally Trever of the American School for Oriental Research in Jerusalem gave the name *The Book of Lamech* to this manuscript, but that did not match with its contents (Trever 1965: 131; Yadin 1957: 16).
of the scroll-team in the Rockefeller Museum, and thanks to him the process speeded up remarkably.

He was helped by advances in technology. With the aid of a computer, Wacholder and Abegg, reconstructed seventeen Cave 4 manuscripts from the Preliminary Concordance made for the official editors of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Manuscripts were published by the Biblical Archaeology Society in September 1991, and led to great consternation (Shanks 1993: XXX). In the same month the Huntington Library of San Marino, California, made its complete photographic archive on the Qumran scrolls available to all qualified scholars. The result of all this was, that the Israeli Antiquities Authority, which had appointed Tov, had to accept that the restrictions on availability of copies of the scrolls must be lifted. When Eisenman and Robinson published a photographic edition of the majority of Qumran fragments in 1991 no restrictions were possible anymore (Vermes 1994a: 10, and 1994b: 101-110). The result has been that many scholars have published papers with new insights. The Qumran research is much more alive.

1.2.2.2. Dating the Manuscripts

The dating method consists of a combination of palaeography, archaeological evidence based inter alia upon the study of pottery and coins, and radiocarbon tests on some linen wrappers of the scrolls (VanderKam, 1994: 17).

Palaeographers study the way in which ancient scribes used to shape letters. It is possible to discern different styles of letter formation in the course of time. There are documents, of which the date is known due to the fact that the date is written on it, or a terminus ad quem is known due to historical events in connection with the site where they were found, e.g. the documents from Masada, which date back to the period before the Roman siege. When the shapes of letters in dated texts are compared with those of letters of which the date is unknown, it is possible to
assign a date to a text. This date is relative. At the beginning of the Qumran research, palaeography was underdeveloped (Vermes 1994a: 3), but nowadays, the palaeographers have reached such a level of precision that a manuscript can be dated "to within twenty-five or fifty years of when it was copied" (VanderKam 1994: 17).

Also, the radiocarbon tests have greatly improved after the first years of Qumran research. In 1950-51 it was impossible to do these tests on the scrolls, because too much material was going to be destroyed in the process. At present, Accelerator Mass Spectometry (AMS) tests are used, which need "only a fraction of the organic material needed for the older carbon-14 method" (1994: 17), with the result that the date of the scrolls themselves could be assessed. An overview of scrolls tested in this way can be found in VanderKam's The Dead Sea Scrolls Today (1994: 18). A good description of the AMS technique, and a discussion of both AMS and the merits of palaeography can be found in: Wölfli and Bonani et al. 1994: 441-453. Although, there are scholars such as Eisenman and Wise (1993: 12-13) who find the above-mentioned combination of methods unreliable; the general scholarly view held today places the Qumran scrolls roughly between 200 B.C.E. and 70 C.E., with a small portion of the texts possibly stretching back to the third century B.C.E., and the bulk of the extant material dating to the first century B.C.E. (Vermes 1994a: 14)

1.2.3. A Survey of the Manuscripts

The texts found in the eleven caves in the vicinity of Qumran have a relationship with the khirbeh (see A.1 and B.1). They are approximately eight hundred in number (VanderKam 1994: 29). Most of the texts are written in Hebrew, some in Aramaic, and there are also a few Greek translations of the Hebrew Bible (LXX). The texts can be subdivided into the following groups:

a) Biblical Texts
b) Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal Texts

c) Community Documents

d) Miscellanea.

Almost all the texts of the Hebrew Bible are represented at Qumran, if only by fragments. Only Esther and Nehemia are absent (Ulrich 1999: 19). Nowadays Ezra and Nehemia are considered one single book. If that was likewise at the time of the community at Qumran, Nehemia was not missing, for Ezra, which was retrieved in Qumran, would represent both works (VanderKam 1994: 31).

Whether the people of Qumran applied the same canonical status to texts of the Hebrew Bible as we do, is debatable. However, Cross writes that "Biblical fragments are most quickly separated and identified" out of the great number of fragments in the Rockefeller Museum in Jerusalem. The reason he provides is, that:

"Usually they have a standard format and are written in an elegant book hand; scribal treatment of non-canonical works is rarely as careful or fine" (Cross 1995: 40).

Thus, the only thing one can conclude is that the books we currently consider canonical, were written with great care.

VanderKam considers the Genesis Apocryphon one of the pseudepigraphal texts (1994: 42). It is written in Aramaic, and what has survived often resembles the pseudepigraphal book of Jubilees. In the Anchor Bible Dictionary it comes under the heading "biblical paraphrase" (Collins 1992: 91. See also 1.3.3. Genre and Name of the Scroll: 22.)

---

3 This does not imply, that the scribes did not edit biblical books (Ulrich 1999: 61- 73).
1.3. The *Genesis Apocryphon*

After this brief exposition concerning Qumran, and its scrolls, I focus upon the subject matter of my dissertation: the *Genesis Apocryphon*. The official siglum of the *Genesis Apocryphon* scroll is 1QapGen (Fitzmyer 1990: 3-5). The *Genesis Apocryphon* belongs to the seven scrolls, which the Bedouin retrieved from Cave I. Mar Athanasius bought the scroll, together with three others, and sold them via an intermediary to the state of Israel in 1954. Since then, the seven scrolls have been reunited in the Shrine of the Book (Heikhal ha-Sefer) in Jerusalem. This institution and the Hebrew University assigned the deciphering and publication of 1QapGen to Avigad and Yadin (AY).

The publication, which took place in 1956, was not an easy task due to the advanced state of decay of the scroll (AY 1956: 8). The scroll may have been lying on the floor of the cave, not protected by a jar, for the one side of it was rotting and crumbling due to its contact with the floor of the cave. The other side, which had been exposed to the atmosphere, was dry and extremely fragile (AY 1956: 12, and Trever 1948: 6-23). Of course the state of the scroll had not improved by the shifting about from place to place during the seven years between the finding and the selling of it to the state of Israel. The damp part of the scroll:

had gone black and crumbled into tiny fragments which stuck to each other in layers. In some places deep holes had formed, penetrating through many layers of the scroll and exposing a smooth, white surface... (AY 1956: 12)

The nature of this surface was unknown (AY 1956: 14). The scroll had not yet been unrolled although the Fogg Art Museum in Cambridge, Massachusetts, had offered to unroll it for Mar Athanasius. However,

---

4 In *The Economist* of July 23rd-29th 1994: 75, there is speech of "a flap of parchment covering part of the text". This might be the white surface mentioned.
he decided to keep it the way it was (Fitzmyer 1971: 2). When the scroll arrived in Israel, the contents of it were still unknown\(^5\). The unrolling of the scroll was assigned to Professor Biberkraut, who had obtained much experience of opening scrolls by opening the three scrolls which Sukenik had purchased on behalf of the Hebrew University. It was his task to spread the brittle part of the parchment without crumbling it completely, and to separate layers, which had stuck together due to the decomposition of the leather. After being opened, it still needed treatment for certain parts to be decipherable (AY 1956: 13). During the process of opening the scroll, Biberkraut discovered no traces of dust in it. This led to the assumption that, like so many other scrolls, it was wrapped in linen during its stay in the cave (AY 1956: 12).

Except for the scroll, 8 fragments (siglum 1Q20) were retrieved from Cave 1, which Milik has published under the title "Apocalypse de Lamech" in *DJD* 1 (1955: 86-87). They probably belong to the same scroll, and their text must have preceeded the extant columns (Fitzmyer 1971: 30).

In 1984 Greenfield and Qimron\(^6\) "were entrusted with the study and publication of the essentially unpublished columns of the Genesis Apocryphon" (GQ 1992: 70). After Greenfield's sudden death in 1995 Qimron, Morgenstern and Sivan met to plan how to publish the material without further delay. This resulted in a preliminary edition in *Abr-Nahrain* 33 (MQS 1995: 30-54). The plans to publish the columns of the *Genesis Apocryphon* one by one changed, when the

---

\(^5\) This needs clarification. Trever of the American School of Oriental Research managed to detach two fragments from the scroll. Those were photographed together and contained the sentence: "Then I, Lamech, hastened and went to Betenosch, my wife..." Due to the fact that this sentence was written in the first person Trever thought that this was the lost *Book of Lamech*, which occurred in an early Greek source. See Trever 1965: 131.

\(^6\) Henceforth, Greenfield and Qimron are indicated by GQ.
researchers discovered that the technique of multispectral imaging enabled them to decipher much more of the text (Qimron 1999: 107). Working with different photographs, and the publication of processed images has meant acquiring new skills, which has been time-consuming. However, a preliminary edition will soon be published (Qimron 1999: 107).

1.3.1. The State of the Opened Scroll

Once open, the scroll proved to miss at least one sheet at the beginning and one sheet at the end. The seam by which the final sheet was connected is still preserved.

The scroll, as it exists at present, consists of four sheets, still held together by three seams. The width and the height of the columns, and the length of the sheets vary. The "overall length of the scroll as preserved, is 2.83 m. and its height 31 cm. It has twenty- two columns in all" (AY 1956: 15).

Due to the damp and the dry parts of the scroll the columns were either partially preserved or showed a gap on the disintegrated side. The result is that either the beginning or the end of the lines have been preserved:

Not one of the first nine columns has been completely preserved in height...

Only the last three columns - that is, the innermost ones in the scroll, have been completely preserved, except for some defects here and there. AY 1956: 13)

Not only the rotting caused the decay of the scroll; the scribe had used a corrosive ink which had reacted with the leather (Jongeling, Labuschagne and Van der Woude 1976: 77)\(^7\). In some places, the parchment around the letters had become dark and gave the impression of "ink spread over a blotting paper" (AY 1956: 13).

\(^7\) Jongeling, Labuschagne and Van der Woude are henceforth indicated by JL.VdW.
By means of infra-red photography those lines in the scroll could be made readable (AY 1956: 13-14). However, at other places the ink had completely eaten away the lines. Those "empty" lines, as Avigad and Yadin put it, covered the major portion of some columns. The three innermost columns, however, which had been preserved so well, had also remained unaffected by the ink (AY 1956: 14). The details of the scroll are well described on pages 14 and 15 in *A Genesis Apocryphon*, and need no further description here.

Another complication in deciphering the scroll was the very thin white surface as mentioned above. Avigad and Yadin did not know the nature of the material and wondered why it was inserted (AY 1956: 14). It covers the lower part of columns X through XV and "has proven inpenetrable to even the most modern modes of photography" (GQ 1992: 70). In *The Economist* of July 23rd-29th 1994: 75, it is said that this was a flap of parchment, through which Dr. Bearman of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena, California, could make photographs by means of a new technique.

In 1956 Avigad and Yadin wrote that the white material adhered very closely to the columns of the scroll and that it could only be removed after special and extensive treatment. Only then they would be able to decipher the text it contains. They published a preliminary survey of the scroll in which column II and the last four columns, i.e. XIX through XXII were presented, and the other columns were summarised, since a complete deciphering of them was not yet possible (AY 1956: 16). The book provided facsimiles, transcriptions and translations of the above-mentioned columns into modern Hebrew and English. In this publication the authors expressed the need for a second edition, in which they would publish the scroll *in extenso* (AY 1956: 8), and provide information about the white
surface stuck to columns X through XV, and describe the methods of treatment and unrolling used by Biberkraut (AY 1956: 13) among other things. However, they never returned to their work on the *Genesis Apocryphon*, except for Avigad, who published "Last of the Dead Sea Scrolls Unrolled" in: *Biblical Archaeologist (BA)* 19, 1965: 22- 24. Their *editio princeps* remained their *editio sola* on the scroll. After Yadin's death in 1984 Avigad located the photographs, and Greenfield and Qimron were entrusted with publishing its unpublished columns (GQ 1992: 70). After Greenfield's death in 1995, Qimron, Morgenstern and Sivan\(^8\) published a preliminary edition in *Abr-Nahrain* 33 (MQS 1995: 30-54) containing the results of research into the text of the *Genesis Apocryphon* by means of imaging spectrometry. This method is based upon the fact that the ink and the parchment have different spectra, which cannot be seen by the human eye, but which can be made visible by means of images made with digital electronic cameras (GQ 1992: 70, and *The Economist* of July 23rd- 29th 1994: 75- 76). This has greatly assisted the reading of former "long-pored-over-blurs" (*The Economist* of July 23rd-29th 1994: 76), and has been of great importance for scroll- research.

### 1.3.2. Further Publications on the *Genesis Apocryphon*

In the preface to the first edition of his commentary on 1QapGen Fitzmyer expressed the opinion that “The time has come for a more definitive translation and an evaluation of the various interpretations, which have been proposed” (1971: IX).

In accordance with what Avigad and Yadin had suggested many scholars had written on the *Genesis Apocryphon*, but no attempt had been made to coordinate

---

\(^8\) Henceforth Qimron, Morgenstern and Sivan are indicated by QMS.
those publications and to treat the text *in extenso*. This is exactly what Fitzmyer had in mind with his commentary.

The following books deal with the texts of Dead Sea Scrolls:

   This book provides translations of Dead Sea Texts.

   This book provides an introduction to the text of the Dead Sea Scrolls, followed by a translation, which is subdivided by means of headings.


   This book contains an introduction concerning the Dead Sea Scrolls, a scroll catalogue, and a translation of the texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls, preceded by an introduction to each text separately.

   The above-mentioned book is a monograph on the *Genesis Apocryphon*, containing a translation with an introduction and footnotes.
Commentary concerning 1QapGen:


After an introduction, this book provides the Aramaic text of the *Genesis Apocryphon* with an English translation and an extensive commentary per verse.

Preliminary publications of sections of the *Genesis Apocryphon:*


This article provides the text of Column XII of 1QapGen, with an English translation, an introduction and a commentary.


This article contains an Aramaic text with the English translation, preceded by an introduction including notes on grammar and vocabulary.


This article supplies information on the progress of the publication of the *Genesis Apocryphon,* and gives the text of column VI 6-9 as an example of a previously unreadable text.

---

9 Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah are henceforth indicated by STDJ.
Publications concerning the language of IQapGen are:

   
   This book deals *inter alia* with the Aramaic in Dead Sea Texts, in inscriptions from Palestine, in the Testament of Levi from the Genisa in Cairo, and in the old Talmudic quotes. It provides a translation of the *Genesis Apocryphon*.

   
   This is a re-publication of an article, which Kutscher published in 1957.

   
   This study contains further findings concerning the language of IQapGen.

   
   This publication contains a postscriptum in which Muraoka comments on the second revised edition of Fitzmyer’s *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1*.

   
   This is a continuation of the above-mentioned study.
Bibliographies in which the *Genesis Apocryphon* feature, are:


1.3.3. *The Genre and Name of the Scroll*

The name of the *Genesis Apocryphon* is closely connected to its genre. That is why I deal with genre and name under the same heading.

When the scroll arrived in Israel the contents of it were still unknown, since it had not yet been opened. However, Trever had managed to detach two fragments from the scroll before Mar Athanasius had sold it. The contents of the fragments, written in Aramaic, led to his conclusion, that this was the thus far unknown, *Book of Lamech* mentioned in a Greek list of apocryphal books (AY 1956: 14). This scroll was referred to as "Book of Lamech", the "Lamech-Scroll", or even the "*Apocalypse de Lamech*" (Milik 1955: 86-87).

Other names of the scroll referred to the last, unidentified scroll in the possession of Mar Athanasius: the "fourth scroll", or the "unidentied fourth scroll".

When the scroll was finally opened and the contents read it was clear that Trever's conclusion was incorrect. The scroll did contain a narrative in the first person singular told by Lamech. However, also Noah, Enoch and Abram related their adventures in the first person. While doing this, the author made them follow the order of the narrative in *Genesis*, sometimes translating it word for word. The free re-working of *Genesis* was done in the manner of *Jubilees*, and thus led to Avigad and Yadin's conclusion that the scroll contained a kind of "apocryphal
version of stories from *Genesis* (1956: 38), hence, the name "*A Genesis Apocryphon*".

Once *A Genesis Apocryphon* was published, comments on this name were abundant. According to Fitzmyer (1971: 5) Meyer considered the name slightly anachronistic since it was doubtful whether the Qumran sect would have thought it to be an apocryphon in the sense we do\(^{10}\).

Other scholars preferred to speak of a targum, or a midrash (Fitzmyer 1971: 9-10), but both names do not really embrace the genre, that is, the literary type of the scroll. There are passages which remind the reader of the word- for- word translation of a targum used in the liturgy, but there are also embellishments in the sense of a haggadic midrash (Weimar 1973: 144), which would render it useless for worship. And again, the midrash- like passages in the *Genesis Apocryphon* have a composition, different from that of the Tannaitic midrashim (Fitzmyer 1971: 9-10). So the text does not fit in that genre either. Since both genres occur in the caves of Qumran in an early stage of their development, it is possible that the distinction we make nowadays had not yet been made that clearly then. The *Genesis Apocryphon* could have been the result of the use of the techniques of both the midrash and targum in one *oeuvre* (Fitzmyer 1971: 10)\(^{11}\).

Other suggestions to name the genre are:

1 Pseudepigraphon (VanderKam 1994: 42). This description is not correct, since at column 21, verse 23, the narrative describes the war of the kings after which in verse 34 Lot is referred to as "the son of *Abram*’s brother", instead of "*my* brother’s son". After this the narrative is no longer in the first person singular, but in the third person. This is in accordance with the


\(^{11}\) The discussion of the genre in this paragraph is indebted at many points to Fitzmyer.
Masoretic text (MT). Biblical paraphrase (Collins 1992: 91). This description of the genre does not really reflect the genre, for a paraphrase is a "Restatement of the sense of a passage in other words" (Pocket Oxford Dictionary) 12 1970: 585). On the other hand, the Genesis Apocryphon partly retells the narrative of Genesis, and partly adds new information and insights, which makes the content of the narrative different.

3 "Parabiblical, since it is both more doctrinal and more literary than midrashic literature and does not quote Scripture directly" (Fitzmyer 1971: 11).

4 A "mixture of Targum, Midrash, rewritten Bible and autobiography", according to Geza Vermes in his The Dead Sea Scrolls in English (1995: 292). Instead of "autobiography" I suggest "pseudepigraphy" in this description, since it is not Noah, Abraham etc. who had written this scroll.

If we want to classify it under one denominator, Vermes' definition "Rewritten Bible" suits best, for the scroll has an exegetical character, which can be seen in the fact that the author tries to update the texts he has chosen from Genesis, and tries to provide solutions to problems arising from reading them. The result thereof is that material of the MT parallel has been left out, and that material from outside the Genesis tradition has been inserted. Thus, the comparison of Genesis 12 with the corresponding columns in the Genesis Apocryphon, makes clear that the author of the latter sought to find answers to questions which arose from reading Genesis 12. Yet, in his explanation he certainly uses existing narrative material about the patriarchs who are evidently his heroes (see also Bernstein 1994: 2-3).

On the other hand, the Genesis Apocryphon follows the texts of the Bible- book,

---

12 Pocket Oxford Dictionary is henceforth indicated by POD.
which the author chose to rewrite\textsuperscript{13}. Thus, even though I prefer to use the term rewritten Bible, I am not opposing the definition of "A Genesis Apocryphon", as we consider it below.

1.3.4. The Date of 1QapGen

In his *Archeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* De Vaux concluded that none of the community's manuscripts was of a later date than the ruin of Qumran (1973: 100-102). This leads to the conclusion that the *terminus ante quem* of 1QapGen is 68 C.E.

In 1965 Avigad published an article in which he grouped 1QapGen in the Herodian class of scrolls to which e.g. *The War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* belongs. This "Herodian" style of writing was applied from the beginning of the Herodian period till the fall of Jerusalem, i.e. from roughly 30 B.C.E. to 70 C.E. (Pp. 56-87, esp. 71 and 74). Avigad's opinion has become the prevailing one, since it is supported by leading palaeographers such as Cross (1995: 94; see also VanderKam 1994: 18; and Vermes 1995: 292).

Linguistic evidence concerning the date of 1QapGen is given by Fitzmyer and Kutscher. Fitzmyer gives a wide period in which the scroll would have emerged. He calls it the "Middle Aramaic Period", which must not be confused with Kutscher's "Middle Aramaic Period". Fitzmyer's "Middle Aramaic Period" lasted roughly from 200 B.C.E. till 200 C.E. "These limits would vary with different localities" (Fitzmyer 1971: 22-23, n.60. He does not specify here when in this period 1QapGen was written).

Kutscher concludes that the *Genesis Apocryphon* probably represents the written

Aramaic of Judea of the first century B.C.E. (1965: 15 and 22)\textsuperscript{14}. For a time there were no other methods available to test and establish the age of the scrolls and fragments, since the carbon-14 method needed 1-3 grams of material for the test during which this material was destroyed. This was more than some of the fragments weighed. The only material which could be used for testing was the linen in which some of the scrolls had been wrapped. This was done at the beginning of the nineteen-fifties. Since then a new method has been developed, named Accelerator Mass Spectometry (AMS), which is "a more refined form of carbon-14 dating" (VanderKam 1994: 17). A good description of this method is given by Wölfli and Bonani (1994: 441-453). Only 0.5-1.0 mg. of organic material is needed for this test. When the AMS test was applied to 1QapGen the result was a date between 73 B.C.E. and 14 C.E. (VanderKam 1994: 18).

Since all the research mentioned above alludes to more or less the same period, we may conclude that the scroll dates back to the late first century B.C.E., or to the first half of the first century C.E.

1.3.5. The Date of the Narrative

In the preceding section, I describe the physical age of the scroll; it is, however, possible that the contents of the scroll reflect an older narrative. There are two prevailing opinions concerning the age of the narrative of the scroll itself. Due to the fact that its "relationship to the mid-second-century book of Jubilees is generally accepted" (Vermes 1995: 292), the only thing that matters is which of the two books was first.

\textsuperscript{14} Wise (1994: 111-119) is one of the few scholars who doubts the reliability of linguistic dating. He argues that the scribes who copied or wrote the scrolls, were influenced by their own Aramaic dialect, which in its turn was biased by historical and sociological factors.
Vermes opts for the *Genesis Apocryphon* being first, since it is "largely devoid of sectarian bias" (1995: 292; and 1961: 96, n.2). However, the passage about the imposition of hands has a function, which does not occur in the Jewish tradition elsewhere (Beyer 1984: 176; see 3.5. Text- Critical and Philological Notes: Column XX: 149). It occurs in the N.T., which indicates that this is a late phenomenon. Consequently, Vermes' remark does not hold. Lignée (1963: 215) even opts for a "Milieu apocalyptique incontestablement. Milieu qumrânien, c'est à dire essénien, très probablement." 1QapGen indeed has apocalyptic characteristics: it is a pseudepigraphon, it admonishes its readers to remain faithful to their God under all circumstances, it presents God as someone who tests his adherents, and it contains an exorcism by means of Abram. However, this evidence is insufficient for proving a link with the Essenes. Apocalypticism as an answer to the question why observant Jews also suffered in the period of Hellenism, was also popular amongst other groups of the Jewish population, as is reflected in *Daniel* and in *Isaiah* 65: 6c- 66: 24.

I agree with Bardtke (1972: 197) that the *Apocryphon* is not dependent on *Jubilees* (See 6.3.6. The Apocryphon's indebtedness to Jubilees: 360). Bardtke (1972: 197) writes that the idea of 1QapGen as the source of *Enoch* and *Jubilees* has also been discarded. There are too many grounds for a later date. More opinions are described in Fitzmyer's *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1* (1971: 16- 19), but none of them are really convincing, except for Kutscher's philological argument in favour of either the first century B.C.E., or the first century C.E. (Kutscher 1977: 3- 36, esp. 24).

According to Fitzmyer, De Vaux suggested in 1967 that the present *Genesis Apocryphon* was the original autograph, since only one copy of it occurred in the vicinity of Qumran whereas *Enoch* and *Jubilees*, and the sectarian writings of
different sorts have been found in multiple copies, and in different caves (Fitzmyer 1971: 14). The term "autograph", however, is not applied correctly by De Vaux. Golb pleads for the use of a correct terminology: an "autograph" (or "holograph" which is the proper name for a literary autograph) is an original writing in the hand of the author, in which deletions occur (1996: 221). Since the Genesis Apocryphon is clearly a copied text, it is not an autograph. Beyer (1984: 175-176) argues that the ה in כָּהַב in 1QapGen XX: 16 is a hearing error. Consequently, he also considers 1QapGen a copied text, and not an autograph. Furthermore, Lange (1996: 192) considers XX: 6b a gloss, which also renders it impossible that the Genesis Apocryphon be an autograph. An autograph, being the original version of a manuscript, does not contain glosses interpolated into the text.

Instead of using the term "autograph" it is better to speak of a unicum, as Golb suggests in a different context, since its stories occur only once in Qumran's collection of books (1996: 221; see also 3.5. Text- Critical and Philological Notes: Column XX: 142). The fact that only one copy of the Genesis Apocryphon was present in Qumran, indicates that the community did not consider it worth copying (see for a discussion on Essene authorship Fitzmyer 1971: 11-14).

---

15 Fitzmyer states that De Vaux wrote this in the Revue Biblique, 74: 101. Eight fragments (siglum 1Q20) were retrieved from Cave 1, which Milik has published under the title "Apocalypse de Lamech" (1955: 86-87). A few other fragments, which might be part of later scrolls of the Genesis Apocryphon, have been found in cave 4 in Qumran. Those fragments deal with Joseph's and Benjamin's lives narrated in the first person singular, similar to the style of the Genesis Apocryphon, but unknown to us from 1QapGen. Their siglum is 4QapGen (Beyer 1984: 186).
1.3.6. The Text

The version of the text, which I use as basis for my study is the one of Fitzmyer in his *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1*. However, when I considered it necessary to change his text, I have made those changes in bold. An account hereof is given in Chapter III.
CHAPTER TWO - AN ANALYSIS OF GENESIS 12: 1-13: 4

Although the diachronic approach has led to many interesting and valuable insights, it does not deal with the book of Genesis as a whole, as the final product of a redactor's hand, or Genesis as part of the Pentateuch; or Hexateuch. However, the synchronic approach provides for those needs. In the synchronic approach due attention is paid to the fact that the Hebrew Bible was supposed to be heard rather than read quietly by an individual. Hence, the powerful cadences characteristic to the Hebrew language (Alter 1996: xxvi), the establishment of leading-words in the text, word play, allusions, and what Fox has termed "small-scale repetition" are of utmost importance (Fox 1983: xviii).16

In this dissertation, I am especially indebted to Fokkelman's literary analysis as described in his Vertelkunst in de Bijbel (1997). Fokkelman describes the relationship between the reader and the text. Reading is an intellectual activity, which gives meaning to the text (1997: 20). The mere fact that the reader starts reading indicates that he or she presupposes that the text makes sense. However, in order to make sense of the narrative the reader must take into account the foreign language, the period and place of emergence, and the Sitz im Leben of the narrative. A good reader is subjective due to the engagement in the text, but controls this subjectivity by accounting for his or her own input for the benefit of the text (20-25). The reader has to find out what the text says, and how the text says it. The latter is necessary to stay alert even though the reader might have read the text often. It is possible, that the reader's own interests, hobbies etc. cause

16 The difference between a leading-word and a small-scale repetition is as follows: a leading-word occurs in a long piece of text, e.g. "see" in connection with Abraham's life (Fox 1983: xvii). However, a small-scale repetition occurs in a brief report and is used to express one specific idea, e.g. just punishment (by means of the lex talionis): the word "ruin" in Gen. 6: 11-13. The people have ruined the world, with the result that God brings ruin upon them (Fox 1983: xix).
bias in the understanding of the text. Hence, the reader must always try to keep an open mind, when reading a text (25-28). It is also necessary to be interested in language, and to know language-rules and conventions (28-29). Fokkelman makes a distinction between:

- **Verteltijd**, i.e. the time, which is necessary to read the narrative. Individuals need different amounts of time to read a narrative. Hence, a clock cannot be used to measure this kind of time. Therefore, Fokkelman renders the time, which is necessary to read a narrative, by means of the number of words of the narrative.

- **Vertelde tijd**, i.e. the narrated time, the period in which a certain narrative plays, e.g. the creation narrative covers a week.

- Chronology. It is important to realise whether the narrator tells the narrative chronologically, or whether anticipation, or a flashback occurs.

The above-mentioned phenomena helps the reader find the answer to the question "How does the narrator tell the narrative?" *In casu* the chronology it is also important to ask: "Why does the narrator break the chronology at this point in time?" (36-38). The time, which is necessary to read the narrative, is important in relationship to the narrated time. It occurs sometimes, that the narrator enlarges upon a certain event or matter, whereas he describes other events or matters very briefly. The reason why the author pays so much attention to the one event, and pays hardly any attention to another, must be discerned by the reader. Also, the indication of time is meaningful. Fokkelman gives the example of 1 Samuel 27:6: “therefore Ziklag has belonged to the kings of Judah to this day”. In this sentence the author makes a joke, for he breaks his detached position as a narrator by
switching to his/her time, although he/she realises well that the reader does not know which period is meant by “to this day” (41–42). According to Fokkelman, the readers hear the voice of the persona, that is, the narrator in the narrative. He/she tells a story about events in the days of old, and shapes the story, the way he/she wants. The narrator orders the time, depicts the space, decides which characters play a role, and which role they play. Sometimes the narrator hoodwinks the audience (op het verkeerde been 1997: 86), but generally spoken, he or she uses the narrative to present his or her vision. While writing, the narrator applies fundamental requirements of communication, such as:

- The narrative must be attractive to the audience
- The audience must be able to follow the narrative
- The narrative must be acceptable and probable.

Hence, the narrators do their utmost to convince their audience. Consequently, a rhetorical analysis is an important tool to understand the narrative (1997: 56–57). Another characteristic of the narrators is that they are omniscient in the literary way; they know what is going on in someone’s heart (even in God’s heart, Genesis 6: 6), or what happens in the Heavenly Court (Job 1: 6–12). They also have the freedom and authority to tell a narrative in a way, which fits their purposes. The narrator of II Samuel 24 presents God inciting David to take a census, which leads to the pestilence. I Chronicles 21 contains the same story, but there it is Satan, who incites David to count the people, with the same result. This is related to the way in which the two narrators describe David. In Samuel he is a miscreant, who is hoodwinked by God, whereas in Chronicles he is idealised. In the narrative both God and Satan are characters (creatures) created by the narrator (1997: 58–61).
Fokkelman also pays due attention to phenomena such as acts, divided into sub-acts (*deelhandelingen*), where it is important to realise who is acting and who is the subject (1997: 74-75). The alternation of acts and direct speech in a narrative also deserves attention. It helps the reader obtain insight in their function in the narrative.

A plot consists of a beginning, a middle and an end. Fokkelman describes the plot as a way, which must be followed in order to reach the end. In the beginning of a story a certain problem, or shortage is mentioned. Thereafter, the exposition takes place, during which all kinds of obstacles and conflicts may occur. The following denouement results in the solution of the problem or the cancellation of the shortage (1997: 77-78).

The questions: “Who is the hero of the narrative?” and: “What is the quest?”, are closely related to each other. The hero is the subject of the quest; he or she wants to achieve something (1997: 79-80). This does not need to be something good; the hero may even be a miscreant. Fokkelman has established three conditions, which assist the readers in their search for the hero of the narrative. Since there are no strict rules these conditions are formulated in the shape of the following questions:

- Is the hero the subject of a quest?
- Is the hero mostly or continuously present in the text?
- Does the hero take the initiative? (1997: 83-84)

Sometimes there is a collective hero, as in *Judges* 21: 6-24, where the tribes constitute the hero (1997: 89).
The appearance and disappearance of characters on the one hand, and the coordinates of time and space on the other hand, can be used to subdivide the narrative. Fokkelman places the appearance and disappearance of the characters in overviews, which indicate how carefully the narratives were constructed. Moreover, the structure conveys a message. In *casu Genesis 27* the structure shows the intimate relationships between Isaac and Esau on the one hand, and between Rebekah and Jacob on the other. However, what is more important, the structure makes clear that the family is broken up into two camps (99-100). Other overviews, which Fokkelman uses to elucidate narratives, are the concentric overview; the *itinerarium* of the hero; an overview of competing persons and their relationship with certain persons and things; and an overview of time and place in a narrative about a journey (99-114). These structural overviews are all made in order to draw conclusions about the meaning of the narratives, because shape and contents are interwoven (99), e.g. symmetries indicate unity and inseparability (148).

Fokkelman also discerns a dialectics of resemblance and difference (119). In the Hebrew language repetitions are abundant, for the technique of varied repetition (*variërend herhalen*) is very popular, and adds to the richness of a narrative. Consequently, the variations in the repetition of words or passages deserve great attention, for they reveal switches in meaning, and indicate a connection between the parts that resemble each other (115-125). According to Fokkelman, a strict repetition of words shows an undeniable correspondence between sections. On the other hand, a semantic resemblance of words (e.g. the name of one place substituted by the name of another place) is not so easy to demonstrate, but other
research may give enough evidence to render the semantic resemblance of words acceptable (121).

Above, it is described how the narrator is literary omniscient, and that he has the authority to shape the narrative in the way he wants. Some of the possibilities of shaping the narrative the way the narrator wants it to be, is the delay of information, or the anticipation of it. Hence, it is important to read a pericope in its context to obtain all the relevant information (126-143; see also 161-175). Another way to enlarge the knowledge of a narrated situation is, to find out whose perspective is presented in the text. Some helpful hints, which Fokkelman gives, are:

- The word  " behaviours (behold) introduces the act of seeing and the astonishment of the eyewitness. It also functions as a tool to draw attention to something.
- The emotional and conceptual points of view of the characters can be derived from their own words, if they do not hoodwink their interlocutor or reader.
- The author does not readily give his/her opinion. Hence, the reader must pay attention to detail. Fokkelman gives the example of Belial ("without profit", denoting the destructiveness, which arises from the fact that neither God, nor his commandments are recognised [156]). Therefore, when people are called "sons of Belial" the author elucidates that according to him or her, these people are evil (143-160).

Another phenomenon in Hebrew literature is the insertion of poetic passages in Hebrew prose by the Hebrew prose- writers themselves. These poetic passages can indicate the denouement of the plot, as in Gen. 21: 1-7 (Isaac’s birth), Gen. 24 (Isaac’s marriage), and Gen. 19 (Lot in and after Sodom; 1997: 182). Another
function is that the detachment of the author in the narrative is temporarily broken. The poetic section deals with the present, is lyrical, and addresses the reader, or God, or another person with thanks, reproach or petition (176-183).

Since it is my aim to compare *Genesis* 12:1-13:4 with the same narrative as related in the *Genesis Apocryphon*, the synchronic approach is the most appropriate for my purpose: i.e. a comparison of two pericopes as such, standing in a certain context. That is why I approach the above-mentioned pericope synchronically in this chapter.

My synchronic reading is in harmony with Sternberg's approach as described in his book *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative* (1987). Therein, he writes that knowledge of poetics is necessary, when working with biblical texts. He describes poetics as "the systematic working or study of literature as such" (1987:2; see also appendix B).

In this chapter I first give a general scheme of *Genesis*, and the place of *Genesis* 12 therein. Secondly, the Hebrew text of Gen. 12:1-13:4 follows, accompanied by Alter's translation, which I have amended at places. Thereafter, my notes and remarks follow, indicating why I have changed Alter's translation. Thirdly, this chapter deals with an analysis elucidating my understanding of the meaning of the text. Thereafter, a summary concerning the message of the text follows.

### 2.1. A General Scheme of *Genesis*

The pericope under study forms a link between two sequential stories in *Genesis*. The first is the primeval story (Gen. 1-11) and the second is the patriarchal story (Gen. 12-50).
The primeval story concerns the origin of the world, the peopling of it, the origins of primary institutions of civilisation, and the source of linguistic division. The patriarchal story concentrates on one family, namely the patriarch, Abraham, and his descendants. Little by little his family expands until, at the end of the book, the origins of the 12 tribes of the Israelite nation emerge. Their experiences are discussed in the other books of the Pentateuch.

The above-mentioned distinction between the primeval story and the patriarchal story might give the impression that the two parts of Genesis do not really form a unity: the perspective in the first part is universal, the perspective in the second part is a specific family. However, that impression may be corrected. There are binding factors between the two parts of the book of Genesis. They are:

- The unfolding history of a family as part of universal history (Alter 1996: xlvi). In Genesis 12: 2 and 3 God tells Abram, that he must be a blessing, and that all the families of the earth will be blessed in him. The universal aspect in the second part of Genesis is present from the outset.
- The concept of life. The book starts with the creation and ends with the belief that there will be life in the Promised Land (Gen. 50: 24-25).
- A fixed point of orientation. Since this factor is the point of departure of this dissertation, it is discussed separately below.

### 2.1.1 A Fixed Point of Orientation

Gitay points out that both in the primeval history and in Abram's call the dominant theme is the notion of land, which is reflected in seven episodes in Genesis (1996: 206)\(^\dagger\). In the first episode it is related to how Adam and Eve lived in the God-

---

\(\dagger\) This paragraph is greatly indebted to Gitay's essay: Geography and theology in the biblical narrative: the question of Gen. 2-12. In: Stephen Breck Reid (Ed.), *Prophets*
given Garden of Eden, and how they were alienated from this geographical centre (Gen. 2-3). Their son Cain becomes a farmer, but since he has spilled Abel’s blood on the ground, it will no longer yield its strength to Cain. As a consequence of his behaviour, Cain will be a fugitive and a wanderer on the earth (Gen. 4: 10-12). However, by building a city (Gen. 4: 17)\textsuperscript{a} Cain contravenes God’s prohibition to settle, because the need for a fixed place of orientation is deeply rooted in humankind (Gitay 1996: 207).

Nonetheless, Cain’s city manifests a denial of the divine command. A tension has been created between humankind’s search for a fixed geographical point, and God’s charge upon them. That is, God had expelled Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden, but humankind cannot tolerate the instability of existence without a fixed point. Henceforth, they consistently search for the geographical center. (Gitay 1996: 207)

After the Flood in Genesis 11, humankind must once again find a place of orientation. Noah becomes a wine-grower (Gen. 9: 20-24), which can lead to happiness, but also to drunkenness, as in Noah’s case. Hence, “humankind’s independent quest for a fixed point now has most deplorable connotations” (1996: 207). The building of the Tower of Babel is another attempt with a negative connotation: the people seek to stay together in the city, but at the same time, they seek to seize God’s territory (Gen. 11: 1-9; 1996: 208). God reacts by making them speak different languages, which definitely nullifies a collective attempt to have one fixed point of orientation. Hence, Terah’s journey to Canaan is the action of an individual, but it is interrupted, and Terah dies while he has not yet achieved his goal (Gen. 11: 31-32). Then God intervenes, and calls Terah’s son Abram, and promises him a land (Gen. 12: 1-9; Gitay 1996: 208). This land proves to be


\textsuperscript{a} Gitay writes in note 4 (1996: 206) that many scholars have been puzzled by the fact that the MT describes the wanderer Cain as a person building a city. However, in the light
Canaan, the very land to which Terah had been travelling. However, there is a difference between Terah’s and Abram’s journeys. Gitay describes it thus: "Canaan is Terah’s selfish human desire" (1996: 208), while Abram responds to God’s call, with the result that Abram's "Canaan is God's designated land" (1996: 208). Hence, God provides Abram and his descendants with the required fixed point of orientation. However, due to fear of nature (famine) Abram leaves God's designated land. Only after his Egyptian adventure Abram realises that God, who gave him the point of orientation, must be his guide, and that neither he nor his descendants may leave the Promised Land on their own initiative (Gen. 12: 10-13: 4; 1996: 205-216). Genesis 12 is therefore the turning point; Abram establishes again the geographical centre given his belief in God. The cycle has been closed; the Garden of Eden opens the cycle and Abram’s descent from Canaan closes it.

2.2. Genesis 12: 1 - 13: 4

of his article Gitay considers this fact purposeful.
2.2.1. Genesis 12: 1-13: 4 Translation and Notes

The translation below is an adaptation of Alter's new translation (1995: 50-54). In the consecutive notes I explain my choice of translation in comparison with the New Translation of the Jewish Publication Society\(^\text{19}\) (Sarna 1989: 88-97) and the translation by Fox (1983: 48-50).

\(^{19}\) Henceforward JPS.
The latter is a very attractive translation, in which the cadences of the Hebrew are clearly visible. However, the consistent concordant translation of the leading-words makes this translation somewhat awkward. The New JPS Translation is slightly too free, and also influenced by doctrinal ideas as can be seen below. Since Alter provides a translation which does not deviate into either of those two directions, I have chosen to use his translation as a basis. My modifications are given in italics.

2.2.2. Translation of Genesis 12: 1-13: 4

Chapter 12

1 And the LORD said to Abram, "Go forth from your land and your birthplace and your father's house to the land I will show you.

2 And I will make you a great nation and I will bless you and make your name great, and be a blessing!

3 And I will bless those who bless you, and the one who damns you I will curse, and all the clans of the earth through you shall be blessed."

4 And Abram went forth as the LORD had spoken to him and Lot went forth with him, Abram being seventy-five years old when he left Haran.

5 And Abram took Sarai his wife and Lot his nephew and all the goods they had gotten and the persons whom they had made- their- own in Haran, and they set out to go to the land of Canaan, and they came to the land of Canaan.

6 And Abram crossed through the land to the site of Shechem, to Elon
Moreh. The Canaanite was then in the land.

7 And the LORD appeared to Abram and said, "To your seed I will give this land." And there he built an altar to the LORD who had appeared to him.

8 And he pulled up his stakes from there for the high country east of Bethel and pitched his tent with Bethel to the west and Ai to the east, and he built there an altar to the LORD, and he invoked the name of the LORD.

9 And Abram journeyed onward by stages to the Negeb.

10 And there was a famine in the land and Abram went down to Egypt to sojourn there, for the famine was heavy in the land.

11 And it happened as he drew near to the border of Egypt that he said to Sarai his wife, "Look, I know you are a woman of fair appearance,

12 and so when the Egyptians see you and say, 'She's his wife,' they will kill me while you they will let live.

13 Say, please, that you are my sister, so that it will go well with me on your count and I shall stay alive because of you."

14 And it happened when Abram came into Egypt that the Egyptians saw the woman was very beautiful.

15 And Pharaoh's courtiers saw her and praised her to Pharaoh, and the woman was taken into Pharaoh's house.

16 And it went well with Abram on her count, and he had sheep and cattle and donkeys and male and female slaves and she-asses and camels.

17 And the LORD plagued Pharaoh and his house with great plagues because of Sarai the wife of Abram.

18 And Pharaoh summoned Abram and said, "What is this you have done to me? Why did you not tell me she was your wife?"
19 Why did you say, 'She's my sister,' so that I took her to me as wife? Now, here is your wife. Take her and get out!"

20 And Pharaoh appointed men over him and they \textit{escorted him}, with his wife and all he had.

Chapter 13

1 And Abram came up from Egypt, he and his wife and all he had, and Lot together with him, to the Negeb.

2 And Abram was heavily laden with cattle, with silver and gold.

3 And he went on by stages from the Negeb up to Bethel, to the place where his tent had been \textit{at the beginning}, between Bethel and Ai,

4 to the place of the altar he had made \textit{there before}, and Abram invoked there the name of the LORD.

\subsection{2.2.3. Notes}

Gen. 12: 1

\textit{γύναικας} GN (1976: 381, §119s) calls \textit{γυναικας} \textit{a dativus ethicus}, which is used "in order to give emphasis to the significance of the occurrence in question for a particular subject." Cassuto (1974: 309-311) has compared many instances where such a form is used, and has concluded that the reference is to someone who goes alone, or with only those who are especially connected with him, and breaks away from the community or group in whose midst he was till that moment. Muraoka goes even further and writes that:

\begin{quote}
it serves to convey the impression on the part of the speaker or author that the subject establishes his own identity, recovering or finding his own place
\end{quote}
by determinedly dissociating himself from his familiar surrounding. (1978: 497)

Whereas all three agree that this is an important event in Abram's life, Murakam emphasises the centripetal force in case of a construction of verbs of motion followed by the preposition ֵ with pronominal suffix. Certainly, this is a decisive moment in Abram’s life. He and his descendants do obtain an identity and a land of their own.

Gitay refers to sound effects indicating decisiveness and emphasis on land. The duplicate sound of מְמַלְמַלְמַלְמַלְמַל מְמַלְמַל:

further strengthens the effect of the call: rush, be decisive. Furthermore, the call, ‘Go from your country and your kindred and your father's house’, is tied together stylistically by the device of sound effect: a series of assonances and alliterations (י). By contrast, the destination, (וֹרְשָׁא לָז, 'go the land’) is disconnected from the remainder of the verse on the basis of its sound. Therefore, the emphasis of the call to Abram is on the land. (1996: 205-206)

By presenting his translation in cola, Fox indicates clearly the cadences of the Hebrew:

YHWH said to Avram:

Go- you- forth
from your land,
from your kindred,
from your father's house,
to the land that I will let you see. (1983: 48)
This approach is very attractive, but the consistent concordant translation of the leading-words makes this translation somewhat awkward, e.g. "I will let you see".

Gen. 12: 1

הנה, n.f. "kindred, birth, offspring" (Brown, Driver and Briggs 1979: 409b), is translated by Alter with "birthplace", since he takes in account the fact that this forms part of the triplet וְהָיָהּ אִשְׁתָּהָלְךָ אֲשֶׁר הָיָהּ אֶלָהֶם, which runs parallel with the triplet in Gen. 22: 2 (בָּאָהָלְךָ אֵלָהֶם). Moreover, the word מָלַל also occurs in a genitive construction in Gen. 11: 28. The triplet forms a climax. Consequently, it is important to note. However, it is neglected in the New JPS Translation, which reads "Go forth from your native land and from your father's house to the land that I will show you" (1989: 88).

Gen. 12: 2

הנה (inv.m.sg.) The Samaritan Pentateuch reads חנה (inv.), but the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia suggests the following vocalisation: חנה (pf. consec.). Alter acknowledges the fact that the MT gives an imperative although this "makes the Hebrew syntax somewhat problematic" (1996: 50), and he agrees with Weinfeld that the author must have wanted to emphasise that "human history reaches a turning point" when "blesses instead of curses" are promised (Alter 1996: 50). Gesenius-Kautzsch describe an imperative depending on a cohortative as follows:

---

20 Henceforth BDB.
21 Henceforth GK.
It "frequently expresses also a consequence which is to be expected with certainty, and often a consequence which is intended, or in fact an intention" (1910: 325, §110i).

Westermann also holds, that the imperative expresses the effects of the blessing. Not only in casu Abram, but also in Jacob's situation the blessing affects "the environment through and beyond the one blessed" (1986: 150). Hence, God promises to bless, and expects from Abram to co-operate with Him and thus be a blessing. God takes Abram asunder in order to re-establish his relationship with mankind, after his intervention in Gen. 11: 11. Hence, I prefer Fox' translation of the imperative: "Be a blessing!" (1983: 48) to Alter's "and you shall be a blessing".

Gen. 12: 3

Here Alter notes, that "the Masoretic Text uses a singular form, but the plural, attested in several manuscripts and ancient versions, makes better sense as parallelism (1996: 51).

His translation is "those who damn". However, I prefer to keep the singular, for in a context full of blessings one curser (in the pi'el, i.e. the intensive form) forms a great contrast. There is no need of more cursers to indicate that Abram and his descendants will also have their opposers. The singular form can also be considered an anticipation of the one person who made life difficult for both Abram and Sarai in this pericope: Pharaoh.

Fox also uses the singular form (1983: 48).

Gen. 12: 3

With Hamilton (1990: 374-375) Alter translates this Nif'al with a passive form, although the primary meaning of a Nif'al is reflexive ("Although the passive
use of Niph' al was introduced at an early period, and became tolerably common, it is nevertheless quite secondary to the reflexive use”, Gesenius- Kautzsch 1976: 138: §51h). I agree with their translation, for “all the clans of the earth” are the subject of the sentence. Speiser (1964: 86), who translates "shall bless themselves", refers to the theological implications: a passive translation suggests influence upon the fate of the nations. I think that is exactly the case: after all the failed attempts by humankind to establish a fixed place of orientation, God takes Abram asunder, and Abram listens to His call. Through Abram God re-establishes His relationship with humankind.

Gen. 12: 4

is translated in the New JPS translation with "commanded". This seems strange, for God was busy establishing a relationship with Abram. Hence, Alter's translation is better.

Gen. 12: 4

Fox translates with "went out", thus suggesting a connection with (1983: 48). Since Alter's translation uses another word ("left") it is to be preferred.

Gen. 12: 5

. I consider the New JPS translation "all the wealth that they had amassed" too extreme, for BDB (1979: 940b) translate with “collect, gather property” and with “property, goods”. Hence, there is no speech of the "amassing" of "wealth". Sarna considers as an anticipation of the ensuing narrative. He holds that this is written in order to show that Abram's affluence in Gen. 12: 16 does not originate with Pharaoh (1989: 90).
However, in his commentary on Gen. 12: 16 he leaves the possibility open that Abram’s wealth was the result of Pharaoh’s compensation (1989: 96). Hence, doctrinal reasons might have led to this extreme translation.

Gen. 12: 5

"...the soul that they had gotten in Haran." My analysis in 2.3. explains why I disagree with the translations of Alter and the Jewish Publication Society. I have used the translation of Fox (1983: 48): "the persons whom they had made- their- own in Harran".

Gen. 12: 5

Fox has translated it: "and they went out to go" (1983: 48), which is very literal and concordant, but in which might suggest a connection with הָלַךְ. Alter has: "and they set out on the way" (1996: 51), which is neither concordant nor literal. I have decided to translate "and they set out to go", which is as concordant as possible.

Gen. 12: 5

The New JPS Translation reads "When they arrived in the land of Canaan..." However, Alter’s paratactic translation is to be preferred, since the very arrival in Canaan is of equal importance to what happens in Gen. 12: 6.

Gen. 12: 6

= teacher. This can be a word- play with סָכָה, but is often considered a name (Fox 1983: 48), perhaps of Canaanite origin (Cassuto 1974:...
27; Speiser 1964: 86). In this verse it is said that the land was not empty: Canaanites were living there. I have decided to leave the name as it is.

Gen. 12: 6

חֶ֣רֶס can refer to a lower place, where terebinths stood. This was often the situation, and is suggested by the locativus in verse 8 "unto a mountain", which was situated higher. חָ֣רֶס is not connected with כּוֹלָ֥ם (Cassuto 1974: 329). Walton and Matthews (1997: 35-36) call the tree a Tabor oak, which was valued for its shade, but which was also associated with fertility. Therefore, it was often adopted as a place for worship.

Gen. 12: 7

מִ֣רְמָחִ֨י. Fox translates this in accordance with the notion of Buber and Rosenzweig that the verb "see" is a leading-word in connection with Abraham: "was seen" (1983: xvii and 48). However, Alter's translation is better, since it indicates that this is an action by the Lord, and not by Abram.

Gen. 12: 7

לֶֽאַתָּ֑י. Alter's word-order in "To your seed I will give this land" is better than the order of Fox, who gives: "I give this land to your seed!" (1983: 48), for Alter emphasises clearly the word "seed".

Gen. 12: 7

אָֽחְזָ֖ה = "to build". By building an altar Abram reacted upon God's promise, that his "seed" would be given this land. Moreover, the construction of an altar:
reacted upon God's promise, that his "seed" would be given this land. Moreover, the construction of an altar:

   can also mark the introduction of the worship of a particular god in a new land. Abram's setting up of altars in each place where he camped defines areas to be occupied in the "Promised Land" and establishes these places as religious centers in later periods. (Walton and Matthews 1997: 36)

Fox's translation "slaughter-site" for הבָּן in Gen. 12: 7, 8 and 13: 4 is a correct translation (BDB 1979: 258a). However, the word "slaughter-site" suggests an abattoir instead of an altar, and this is clearly a slaughtering in religious sense. Hence, BDB's suggestion to translate with "altar" is to be preferred (1979: 258a).

Gen. 12: 7

הָנָּבָן הבָּן וַתִּהְיוּ בֶּן לְוַדָּה. The word הבָּן is absent in Alter's translation, although it is not superfluous. It indicates that Abram built the altar at the very place where God had made His promise.

Gen. 12: 8

אָלָה. Alter's pictorial translation in American English renders beautifully the sound of הבָּן.

Gen. 12: 8

הָנָּבָן (דִּקְרָא). From the context (altar) it is clear that Abram invokes the name of the Lord. However, Cassuto (1974: 332) translates with "proclaim". This is a possible translation, but not a very obvious one since no mention is made of bystanders. (KB 1983: 1054: 8). Fox's translation "called out the name of YHWH" (1983: 48; see also Gen. 13: 4) takes the leading-word into account, but does not convey the real meaning of the expression.
Gen. 12: 9

ъ́פֶנִבָּה refers to a long continuance. (GK 1976: 344, §113u).

Gen. 12: 10

ןַחְיָה (יִֽנְחָה). In the literal topographical usage this word describes a movement that is downhill (I Kings 22: 2 = II Chr. 18: 2), or that goes from north to south (Ju. 1: 9; II Kings 10: 13; Dt. 1: 25 etc.). Most typically it is used for the road to Egypt (Gen. 42: 2; Num. 20: 15; Dt. 10: 22 etc.), such as we see in our pericope (BR 1990: 317-318). However, this word can also be interpreted figuratively, in the sense that he was morally on the decline. Immediately after verse 10 Abram starts making a plan to prevent problems which do not yet exist. This plan leads to many moral problems, and reveals that Abram’s confidence is also on the decline as soon as he leaves Canaan.

Gen. 12: 10

הָֽנִּבְנָה; לְֽנִבּֽוֹ= to sojourn, dwell for a time, dwell as a newcomer, without original rights (e.g. Gen. 19: 9; Dt. 18: 6; Ju. 17: 7-9, and 19: 1; BDB 1979: 157b). This description does not say anything about the time Abram would spend in Egypt. The fact that Abram was a nomad, travelling with his cattle from one grazing place to another suggests that this sojourn would be temporary. The syntactical structure, however, gives reason for a different interpretation. Gitay compares Gen. 12: 10 with Ruth 1: 1. In both verses a person escapes the famine in the Promised Land. In Gen. 12: 10 the subject Abram is connected with Egypt, since

22 This is in contrast with Wenham 1987: 287.
both names stand next to each other. In *Ruth* 1: 1 there are four words between
the man and his destination. Moab features only at the end of the sentence. This
shows us the theological concern of Abram’s wish to exchange God’s Promised

Gen. 12: 10

הַנַּעַר. Fox’s translation "heavy" is better than Alter’s translation "grave", since it is
comprehensible in English, and it indicates a connection with יָבַע in Gen. 13: 2.

Gen. 12: 11

Fox preserves the connection between the beginning of verses 11 and 12 in his
translation. Whereas, Alter begins verse 11 with “And it happened...”, and verse
12 with “and so...”, Fox writes “It was...” and “It will be...” This connection is
continued in Gen. 12: 14-16, but it is not so evident that Alter’s translation should
be abandoned.

Gen. 12: 11

Alter’s translation “drew near” for בָּאָמְרָה is better than Fox’s translation “came
near” (1983: 49), which suggests a relationship with יָבַע. On the other hand, the
insertion of the word “border” in Alter’s translation is not strictly necessary.

Gen. 12: 11

יִדוּרָה. Alter translates this with “a beautiful woman”. Fox’s translation
“fair to look at” (1983: 49), which preserves the Hebrew expression, is better.
Walton and Matthews write, that the expression יִדוּרָה: “is sometimes
used to describe male good looks (1 Sam. 17: 42), but it may be important to note
that the phrase is also used to describe a fine specimen of cow (Gen. 41: 2)'" (Walton and Matthews 1997: 37). In order to indicate that this is an expression I have translated it very literally.

Gen. 12: 11

A perfect tense can indicate feelings or characteristics. (See Psalm 42: 3; 92: 6; 119: 97; and Gen. 27: 2; Lettinga 1976: 164-165) In this context it is best translated with a present tense.

Gen. 12: 12

Here is a reserve arrangement of words in the noun-clause, resulting in a special emphasis on the predicate (GK 1976: 454, §1411). Alter has tried to reflect this emphasis by contraction: "She's his wife". This emphasis is not visible in Fox's translation "She is his wife" (1983: 9).

Gen. 12: 13

Here is another reserve arrangement of words in the noun-clause, resulting in a special emphasis on the predicate (GK 1976: 454, §1411). I have reflected the emphasis by means of a diacritical sign. See also Gen. 12: 19: wife.

Gen. 12: 13

Van Dijk- Hemmes translates this with "for the price of you", analogous to the preposition's meaning in Amos 2: 6 and 8: 6. She does so since Abram's:

first argument aims at his own well-being or, rather, at his own prosperity... Sarai's beauty, which would cost Abram his life in his capacity as her husband, can, and indeed will, yield him a profit in his capacity as her brother. To Sarai's ears the preposition used by Abram may sound like 'at the cost of you'. (1993: 229)
Although I fully agree with what Van Dijk-Hemmes writes about Sarai's feelings, I prefer the translations of Alter "on your count" and Fox's "on your account" (1983: 50) which are less extreme, for Sarai has no say whatsoever in this text. Moreover, it is Abram who is speaking at that moment. Although his behaviour is extremely selfish, it is doubtful whether he would state this as bluntly as Van Dijk-Hemmes interprets. My opinion is supported in the second part of verse 13, where Abram emphasises that he does this all because of her. This suggests that he wanted to tone down what he had said first.

Gen. 12: 14

♀. Object-clauses are introduced by ♀. Direct narration, however, is also frequently introduced by that word. "Frequently, indeed, with the secondary idea of a particle of asseveration, even when the direct narration is not expressly indicated" (GK 1976: 491, §157b). Alter has left this ambiguity in his translation, whereas the translations of Fox and the JSP have interpreted this as an object-clause: "how exceedingly fair the woman was" (Fox 1983: 50); "how very beautiful the woman was" (JSP 1989: 95).

Gen. 12: 15

♀♀ (♀♀). Various forms of this word are used in this pericope (Gen. 12: 5, 16 and 19), and especially its meaning in reference with Pharaoh's "taking" of Sarai is interesting. Did Pharaoh take her and have sexual intercourse with her? BR (1984: 589: 12) tells us that ♀♀ is used very frequently. It introduces the actually
meant action, for which the subject is responsible. BR (1984: 591: II3) suggests that the word can also be a termınus technicus for marriage of which examples can be found in Gen. 4: 19; 11: 29; 20: 2f. II4 on page 592 of the same volume shows that neither the modus (violence, unlawfulness etc.), nor the privative are emphasised, but, “sondern”, the act of “taking for oneself”. “...den Modus muß man im Prinzip aus dem Kontext ergänzen...” (See Jer. 20: 5; I Sam. 2: 16; Gen. 31: 34; I Chr. 7, 21; Gen. 27: 35-36.) In verse 19 the imp. consec. only tells us of the possibility of taking Sarai as wife. This suggests that Pharaoh did not have sexual intercourse with her yet.

Gen. 12: 15

The New JPS Translation interprets this with Pharaoh’s palace (Sarna 1989: 95). However, there is a relationship between היה in this verse and היה in verse 17: Pharaoh’s house (-hold) must suffer because he has taken Sarai into his house. Hence, I prefer to translate “house” as Alter does.

Gen. 12: 17

Fox’s translation “plagued Pharaoh with great plagues” (1983: 50) is more concordant than Alter’s.

Gen. 12: 18

Fox’s translation “Pharaoh had Avram called” (1983: 50) is good English and it is concordant, but it reveals nothing of Pharaoh’s anger which is discernable in the context. Hence, I prefer Alter’s translation, “And Pharaoh summoned Abram”.

23 Botterweck and Ringgren do not indicate the biblical references for this statement.
Gen. 12: 18

must be considered a demonstrative pronoun (GK 1976: 442, §136c). הָנָּה is originally interrogative, but is used here to introduce an exclamation of indignation (Ibid. 471, §148a).

Gen. 12: 19

is a very brief sentence. It reveals Pharaoh's anger and frustration. Alter's translation "get out!" fits better in the context than Fox's concordant translation "go!" (1983: 50).

Gen. 12: 19

For my translation wife see Gen. 12: 13, first entry.

Gen. 12: 20

It is interesting that Fox translates הָנָּה, "escort" (1983: 50) less concordantly than Alter, "send". Since it is to be expected that Abram and Sarai were escorted, I prefer Fox's translation.

Gen. 13: 1

This verse starts with הָנָּה, which forms a contrast to הָנָּה in Gen. 12: 10. הָנָּה means: to go up, ascend, climb from low place to high (BDB 1979: 748a). Similar to הָנָּה in Gen. 12: 10, this is meant both literally and figuratively.
Gen. 13: 2

*(כבר* is an adj. m. sg. meaning “very rich in…” (BDB 1979: 458a: 2c). *(뿐* is “1. cattle in gen. …as purchasable domestic animals … 2. specif. of cows, sheep, and goats in herds and flocks” (BDB 1979: 889a).

Gen. 13: 3

*(.btnAdd* = n.[m]. pulling up, breaking camp, setting out, journey. 2. station, stage, journey (by stages) (BDB 1979: 652b). Again, Fox’s translation is concordant, “He went on his journeyings”, but Alter’s translation renders more clearly the process of travelling: “And he went on by stages”.

Gen. 13: 3

*(addTranslation*) = "at the first, first (or former) time, i.e. first in a series of occurrences" (BDB 1979: 321a). Abram goes back to the altar of Gen. 12: 8.

Gen. 13: 4

*(addTranslation*) = fem. c. prep. as adverbial phrase: (1) of time = before, formerly (BDB 1979: 911b). *run parallel with* in verse 3.

2.3. A Reading of Genesis 12: 1-13: 4

God ordered Abram to put his trust in Him (אַלְבֶּרֶם), and leave the land he knew, and, what is more important, his family (אֵלֶּבֶנֶּר). God had great plans with Abram, and through him the nations of the world would benefit (אַלְבֶּרֶם). It is interesting to see, that Terah, Abram’s father, had already planned to go to Canaan, but died before he reached it (Gen. 11: 31-32). In fact, *Genesis* 11: 31 of the MT tells us, that Terah and his companions settled
in Haran. The text remains silent about the reason for settling down, whether they did so due to Terah's age and his incapability to travel on, or due to the fact that he had changed his mind, or even on account of another reason.

Sarna tells us about two traditions concerning this event. He writes, that on the one hand, on the grounds of the MT, there is a tradition, that Terah lived 60 years after Abram left for Canaan. On the other hand, according to the Samaritan tradition Abram left when Terah had died being 145 years of age (1967: 108, note 12). It seems strange that Abram, Sarai and Lot would leave an old man all by himself in Haran (see Gen. 11: 31; 12: 1 and 12: 5). According to Ellen van Wolde, Terah's whole genealogy bears the stamp of death (1997: 177). She sees a great contrast between the genealogies of Shem in Gen. 10 and 11. Gen. 10: 21-31 is a list full of life; the continuation of life gets so much emphasis that the ancestors' deaths are not even mentioned. Gen. 11: 10-32 is different; till verse 25 only individuals are mentioned, namely the first-born sons, and mention is made of their ages, and all of them had "other sons and daughters". However, no deaths are mentioned yet.

In Gen. 11: 27, when Terah's genealogy is given, the scene changes dramatically first of all his son Haran dies (Haran's son Lot has already been born), and Terah's oldest son is married to an infertile woman. This last fact is even mentioned twice. When Terah leaves Ur of the Chaldeans his son Nahor and wife Milka remain behind (Gen. 11: 31). This break suggests nothing good for Terah's continued existence. When Terah dies in Haran his only living descendants are Abram, whose name means "exalted father" (see BDB 1979: 4b), the infertile Sarai, and their nephew Lot. Shem's (i.e. Terah's) lineage is obsolescent (Van Wolde 1997: 177). Lot was possibly considered Abram's heir-to-be, but that is not stated in the text.
Death is certainly the most important subject in this part of Shem’s genealogy. Death, and the non-fulfilment of the great plans of humankind are central. Theologically spoken this is not surprising. As explained by Gitay (1996: 208) Terah’s motive was egoistic: driven by the need to have a place of his own, he set out for Canaan. It was his initiative. After the building of the Tower of Babel had failed, he was the first to look for a place of orientation as an individual. He made plans for himself and his progeny, without the intention of improving the situation of others. Abram’s journey is different. God initiates it, and wants Abram to be a blessing to others (Gitay 1996: 206-208).

God speaking to Abram occurs like a bolt from the blue. The last time that God spoke in Genesis was when He confused the language of the inhabitants of Babel. Thereafter, Genesis 11 enlarges on Shem’s genealogy without mentioning God’s name even once. This genealogy comes to an anti-climax, when Shem’s (i.e. Terah’s) lineage appears to be obsolescent (see above).

Then God intervenes. His speech to Abram is three verses long, and it is evident, that He does not only have plans for Abram, but that Abram is supposed to be an instrument in order to bless humankind. In verse 7 He speaks to Abram again. This makes God’s promises of life (progeny) and land prominent.

Abram did not go alone. It is mentioned twice that Lot went with him (Gen. 12: 4-5). Lot’s father had died in Ur and his grandfather, Terah, had taken care of him ever since (Gen. 11: 28-31). If one chooses the Masoretic tradition, Terah was still alive, when Lot went with Abram, for Terah was seventy when Abram was born (Gen. 11: 26). Abram, in his turn, was seventy-five, when he departed from Haran (Gen. 12: 4). Hence, his departure took place one hundred- and forty-five years after Terah’s birth. Terah died when he was two hundred- and five years
old. Consequently, at the moment of Abram’s departure Terah had another sixty years to live.

If one chooses the Samaritan tradition (Sarna 1967: 108, note 12), however, it was logical that Abram, being the head of the family after Terah’s death, took care of Lot. Lot is the only male of the family mentioned as going with Abram. Verse 5 seems to be an elaboration of verse 4: Sarai, who plays an important role from verse 11 onward gathered substance and “souls that they had gotten” are added. Who were those souls? In verse 16 slaves and handmaids are included in all the possessions they had gathered. Here, in verse 5, they stand loose. In Hebrew נammad is not used for acquiring slaves (BDB 1979: 795a)⁴, and according to the text, Abram “made souls” in Haran only. These three reasons are advanced in the Jewish Tradition to explain why those souls must be converts, made by Abram and Sarai, in Haran (Cassuto 1974: 320). It seems to me that these souls were in fact slaves from Haran, who had the same background as Abram and Sarai, and were therefore easily accepted as belonging to Abram’s people (“clan”). This would explain why these people were mentioned as “souls” in contrast to the man-; and maid- servants (“slaves”) of verse 16. Fox’s translation “the persons whom they had made- their- own in Harran” (1983: 48) leaves space for my interpretation. The man-; and maid- servants of verse 16 were obtained in Egypt, from a strange nation with a strange language and culture. It is likely that they had a less close relationship to Abram and his relatives than the “souls” gotten in Haran, and that it was more difficult for them to adjust to the ways of Abram and his clan. Sarna, however, states, that wealth and souls are mentioned in

---

⁴ BDB 795a explains the word in this way: “acquire property of various kinds (cf. ‘make money’). As examples are mentioned: Gen. 12: 5; 31: 1; Is. 15: 7; Je. 17: 11; 48: 36, which do not mention or suggest slaves. On the other hand, BDB mentions Dt. 8: 18; Ez. 22: 13; 28: 4.4; 38: 12; 2 Chr. 32: 29 and Ec. 2: 8 which exclude slaves.
anticipation of verse 16, to show that “Abram’s affluence does not derive from Pharaoh’s gift”. This is right, but it does not explain the different formulations in verses 5 and 16 (Sarna 1989: 90).

When Abram has followed up what God has ordered him to do in verse 1, God gives him another promise: that He will give his descendants this land. This is strange, because from Gen. 11: 30 we know that Sarai was barren. According to Sarna (1989: 87) כִּיָּם simply means “childless”, but not necessarily infertile. BR (1989: I, 344), however, gives “infertile” as first meaning, “without descendants” as second meaning “unfruchtbar, ohne Nachkommen”, and in II, 2 (1989: 345) BR makes no distinction between infertile and childless. The result, of course, is the same.

Abram’s reaction to God’s promise is to build an altar for the Lord (Gen. 12: 7). The beginning of verse 7 suggests that Abram had also seen the Lord (יְהֹוָה), and that he had received the promise that his offspring would inherit the land. Sarna (1989: 92) states, that נָאָס in the Nif'al is a technical term for divine self-disclosure. “such a usage need not imply any visual accompaniment to the oral communication.” Samuel (I Sam. 3: 15) has a vision, but only hears God. However, God only “says” something in Gen. 12: 1. Moreover, in verse 7 there is mention of an “appearance” of the Lord, which gives the impression of a greater closeness between God and Abram. Therefore, I would like to express that closeness by mentioning that Abram ‘saw’ the Lord, although that might technically not be a certainty.

In verse 8 Abram builds another altar. Cassuto (1974: 332) reminds us of the fact that a charge is sustained on the evidence of two or three witnesses, according to Dt. 19: 15. This would show us how eager Abram was that God reward all the
trouble he had leaving his country of origin. See also the notes on Gen. 12: 7 (third entry).

Abram continued journeying. He travelled around and never remained in the same place, because he had to find grazing for his cattle and because he might have participated in the caravan trade. Verse 6 reads "the Canaanite was in the land". This might be the reason why Abram travelled between sites in the central mountain range and the Negeb. Those regions were sparsely populated (Sarna 1967: 105-106; 1989: 90-91). That Canaan remained Abram's "land of sojournership" is stated in Gen. 17: 8. Gen. 23: 2-20 makes clear, that Abram had to buy land to bury Sarai. It was only generations later that his descendants would own the land.

A problem occurs; famine. Abram, journeying all the time, sets out for Egypt to survive. In Gen. 12: 1 and 7 it is the Lord who takes the initiative to make contact with Abram. Here God remains silent and so does Abram. This suggests, that Abram's journey to Egypt is undertaken on his own account. It is not part of God's plan. That is why Abram uses his own ingenuity to prevent problems, similar to what he must have done before his first encounter with God. Note, that Abram is at ease in Canaan, but becomes uneasy as soon as he is about to leave that country. This indicates that Abram senses that he is all by himself now that he goes his own way without even consulting his Partner.

God has called Abram in Haran (Gen. 11: 31-12: 3), but He has revealed himself in Canaan (Gen.12: 5-7) with the result that Abram builds an altar (Gen. 12: 7). Both events indicate, that Canaan is a special land, a sacred place, the heritage of God. Thus, when Abram leaves the land because of the famine, this is a serious matter. Gitay (1996: 209) concludes that "the issue is the fear of God (the
promise) versus fear of nature (famine), and the fear of nature controls Abram’s actions: he leaves God’s designated land.”

Furthermore, Gitay shows us that the syntactical structure of Gen. 12: 10, where Abram’s name and Egypt follow each other immediately, reveals that Abram’s destination is Egypt, in contrast to God’s plan (1996: 213-214). Hence, Abram is not only acting without consulting his Partner; he turns his back on God for fear of nature. It is ironical, that once Abram escapes the famine, nature has another problem in store for him.

Several commentators are puzzled that a sixty-five year old woman can look beautiful. They concluded that she was sixty-five at the time, on the basis of Gen. 17: 17 and 12: 4 (Cassuto 1974: 346-347; Keil and Delitzsch 1975: 197). However, the fact that her attractiveness caused problems is more important than the calculation of her exact age. That is proven by the structure of the story concerning her beauty, which culminates in verse 15.

Abram is afraid that the Egyptians will kill him in order to have Sarai for themselves25. This can be understood very well when we consider his position. In Gen. 12: 10 it is said, that Abram and his house went to Egypt to sojourn there, because of the famine. Sojourners are people without original rights with the result that they are dependent on the good-will of people who are foreign to them. Sarna writes correctly:

In biblical texts the *ger* is usually classified along with the deprived and under-privileged of society. ...whom it is forbidden to oppress and to whose needs one must be particularly sensitive. (1989: 93)

He mentions Ex. 22: 20 and Dt. 10: 18-19 and 14: 29 as examples. Hence, (due to experiences in Egypt) it is part of the biblical tradition to have empathy for

25 Several important aspects of Gen 12: 12-17 are dealt with separately after this analysis.
people in such a situation, but this empathy was not to be expected from the Egyptians at this stage.

If Abram were killed he would no longer be able to bear responsibility for Sarai, and the possibility that Sarai would be subjected to the lust of those strangers induced Abram to devise his ingenious plot as described by Cassuto (1974: 350). It was ingenious indeed, for as Sarai’s brother Abram could protect Sarai and would not be a problem to potential lovers. He would have the authority to give her in marriage, and he would be able to put husbands in spe off with words till the famine was past. Thereafter, Abram and Sarai could go back to Canaan, and the problem would be solved.

However, Abram did not envisage, that the rumours, which were bound to go round about Sarai’s beauty, would not only circulate amongst the common Egyptians. It was likely, that they would eventually reach higher circles in the Egyptian society, with the result that Pharaoh’s officials spoke about her to Pharaoh, and that he, the powerful ruler par excellence, simply ordered that Sarai be taken into his house (Cassuto 1974: 353). This climax is described in Genesis 13- 15. Similar to his father’s plan (initiated by Terah himself), so Abram’s plan (initiated by Abram himself26) failed dramatically. Only God would be able to solve the problem.

In Gen. 12: 16 is written that Pharaoh found favour with Abram for Sarai’s sake, after which Abram’s acquisitions are broadly measured out. It is possible, that this is the śp n s.h m.t, i.e. the “price or compensation for (marrying) a woman” (Pestman 1961: 17), which was a gift the Egyptian bridegroom used to make to the bride’s father (Pestman 1961: 50 and 108), whose place was taken by Abram

26 Van Dijk-Hemmes 1993: 228 writes correctly “...that Abram himself is fully responsible for the survival strategy that he outlines for himself here”.
passing for Sarai’s brother. The value of the šp during the period in which Abram could have lived is unknown (Pestman 1961: 13- 14), but it is likely that Pharaoh, as the king of Egypt, gave Abram a greater šp than normal. On the other hand, it seems as if Pharaoh bribed Abram (see 2.5. Genesis 12: 8- 13: 4 as a concentric narrative: 74), which sheds a different light on the reason for the gifts and their value (see 3.5. Text- Critical and Philological Notes, Column XX, “And the king gave”: 166).

The verses 16 and 17 stand in a glaring contrast to each other. Pharaoh found favour with Abram for Sarai’s sake, but the Lord plagued Pharaoh because of Sarai. God’s plagues seem extremely unjust considering the fact that Pharaoh found favour with Abram. Probably ‘for Sarai’s sake’ (יהוה יכפיה in verse 16;sarhא in verse 17) both good and evil are done. Sarai is a central figure, although we do not hear her speak one word (שא), never mind יכפיה. Nonetheless, this passage could suggest that she uttered her distress to God and reminded Him of the covenant (Van Dijk- Hemmes 1993: 230- 232).

The text does not give any information about the character of the plagues, but Sarna (1989: 96- 97) suggests that the plagues were a “temporary sexual impotence induced by some severe inflammation or acute infection of the genital areas” (cf. Gen. 20: 17f).

Incidentally, there seems to be a word play behind the Hebrew expression, for the stem נ- ג- ‘ can mean ‘to afflict, plague’, as well as ‘to come to physical contact with, to harass sexually’ (cf. Gen. 20: 6; 26: 11; Prov. 6: 29; Ruth 2: 9). (Sarna 1989: 96- 97)

Sarna’s suggestions look plausible. The text merely states, that the plagues were great, but they were possibly also incurable. Surely, an important person such as

---

2 The period in which Abram could have lived is the 19th century B.C.E. according to Gispen (1975: 11 and 191).
Pharaoh would have consulted the best doctors available to get rid of the plagues. Since they evidently could not achieve anything, Pharaoh realised that he had to do with a Power greater than he or his doctors. This Power probably punished him for something he had done, with the result that Pharaoh started investigations into the cause of the afflictions. Since those plagues evidently had to be linked with Sarai’s arrival in his house, the conclusion of Pharaoh, and perhaps his councillors, was that Sarai was not Abram’s sister, but his wife.

Consequently, Pharaoh summoned Abram to reproach him about his behaviour. I have translated “summoned”, since the “conversation” leaves no place for Abram’s arguments, in contrast with Abram’s conversation with Abimelech in Gen. 20: 18-19. Pharaoh does not leave room for any defense or reaction. In Gen. 12: 15 Sarai is simply taken into Pharaoh’s house, without asking Abram’s consent. Moreover, Pharaoh gives Abram presents without expecting him to react in any way, for Pharaoh does not leave space for a dialogue. Truly, Abram had reason to be afraid in this strange country!

But Pharaoh had reckoned without his Host. He thought he could do as he pleased, but Abram’s Great Protector showed him the limits of his power. The only thing Pharaoh could do was try to restore his dignity by blaming Abram for his own faults; he blamed Abram that he had not reacted to his taking Sarai into his house. He blamed him for never explaining why he said that Sarai was his sister. Pharaoh’s solution of the problem is brief: “Take and go!” This shows the acknowledgement of his defeat. And to make sure that he would never have to deal with Abram anymore, Pharaoh ordered his men to send Abram and Sarai and all that he had, away. Whether his afflications were cured is not mentioned in the text in contrast to Gen. 20: 17. That is not important to the narrator. The narrator
probably just wants to show that God has made a promise to Abram, and that He will stand by Abram, and that He will make sure that His promise is fulfilled. Thus, Gen. 12 starts with the order יְלַכְכֶנָּא from God’s mouth, and ends with the angry order יִלֶכָּא from Pharaoh’s mouth. Abram can neither stay in Haran nor sojourn in Egypt. God has a plan for him.

Abram went up, back to Canaan. Lot, who did not feature in the story about Egypt, went with him. His name is mentioned in connection with the parting of ways, which takes place in the sequence of the narrative. Gen. 13: 2 indicates that Abram was very rich in cattle, silver and gold. Janzen emphasises Abram’s richness when he leaves Egypt. Since Gen. 12: 5 shows that he already had many possessions when he left Haran, I think that this emphasis on a “sevenfold enrichment” (Janzen 1993: 26) is not correct. The story deals with famine and survival, and the very fact that we observe a shift from survival to possessions suggests that food or famine do not matter anymore. Probably there is enough grazing for his livestock, and his silver and gold will do, to obtain food; the famine is thus over. Abram went back in stages to the place where his tent had been in Gen. 12: 8, before his adventure in Egypt. The words “at the beginning” (Gen. 13: 3) and “before” (Gen. 13: 4) run parallel, and emphasise that Abram makes a new start with the Lord. Hence, Abram’s ascension to Egypt is not only meant literally, but it also refers to his morale, which is on the increase.

2.4. The Major Motives in the Text
In Gen. 12: 2 and 7 God promises Abram much offspring, on which He bestows blessing and a great name, and land for this progeny. Those promises are endangered in several ways and at several instances. The most important instances in relation with Abram are:
• The journey to Egypt.
• The event of the endangered ancestress (Gen. 12 and 20). Sarai is endangered by the lie that she is Abram’s sister. The two events occur when Sarai does not yet have a son.
• The division of the Land between Abram and Lot (Gen. 13: 8-13), which was a violation of the understanding that Abram’s offspring would inherit the whole Land.
• Abraham’s fight against the Kings, where he could lose his life before even having offspring (Gen. 14).
• The offering of Isaac, Sarah’s only son (Gen. 22).

Since this dissertation deals with Gen. 12: 1-13: 4, only the two instances in that pericope are discussed:
• Abram ceased the occupation of the Land promised to his progeny (Gen. 12: 7). Consequently, it would be difficult to lay claim to the Land.
• In doing so, he also discontinued worshipping on the altars to God. The building of altars, and the subsequent sacrificing to God on those altars implied that the cult of the God was introduced there (Walton and Matthews 1997: 36). Hence, when Abram ceased sacrificing on the altars in Canaan²⁸, he discontinued the cult of the God for whom the altars had been erected. This could be considered unfaithfulness to the God of the promise.

²⁸ *Genesis* 12 does not elucidate, whether Abram discontinued the worship of God when he was in Egypt
• Moreover, when Abram was in Egypt, his life and, consequently, his continued existence, were in danger (Gen. 12: 12-13), with the result that the fulfilment of the promise was endangered.

• By passing his wife as his sister he endangered God’s promise once more, for it was through Sarai that the promise of a son would be fulfilled, since she was Abram’s wife at the moment when the child was promised (Gen. 11: 31-12: 3. This notion is sustained by Gen. 17: 15-22 and 18: 9-15).

2.4.1. Three Generations and the Famine

In Genesis all three archfathers at a certain moment plan to go to Egypt to flee the famine in Canaan. Below, those instances are compared in order to draw relevant conclusions.

Abram was promised Land for his descendants. Hence, the land never belonged to him. However, whether he would ever have offspring was also a matter to be questioned. Nonetheless, he travelled through the land in order to see it (Gen. 12: 6, 8-9). Isaac probably had the same plan when he went to Gerar, to King Abimelech of the Philistines (Gen. 26: 1). Whether he went there when Esau and Jacob had already been born or not, is not clear from the context.

---

29 Although I do not want to elaborate on Formcritical matters in this synchronic study I consider it important not to neglect the order of the narrative in Genesis 25 through 27 (see also Sternberg 1987: 15). Gen. 25: 20-26 indicate that Isaac and Rebekah were married for twenty years, when Esau and Jacob were born. Thereafter, a summary of what happens in Gen. 27 follows. Gen. 26 seems to be an interpolation and it might reflect the period before the boys were born, for they are not mentioned there. Moreover, God promises Isaac numerous offspring in two instances (Gen. 26: 4 and 24), and only in Gen. 26: 22 Isaac shows confidence in the future.
2.4.2. The Question of Abram’s Behaviour

While considering the above-mentioned, let us also have a look at how Abram’s behaviour in Gen. 12 should be evaluated. The structure of Gen. 12 is illuminating. The first part (Gen. 12: 1-9) conveys the notion of Abram the believer, who follows God’s call without reservation. On the other hand, while he is in the Land, he submits himself to nature: famine. He leaves the country, and puts his wife in a precarious position regarding the proclamation that she is his sister.

In connection with the promise it was thoughtless that Abram did not consult God before he left Canaan. They had an agreement according to Gen. 12: 1-3 and 20: 13.

Abram’s second mistake was his ingenious plan. He should have consulted God, who would have told him what to do. The third problem was, that Abram could not help accepting Pharaoh’s friendliness, although he himself had not been sincere to him. This must have been a horrendous experience for Abram. He had to accept the gifts as a result of his lie, but each gift must have added to the feeling of betraying Sarai instead of caring for her; exactly the opposite of what he said he wanted to achieve. Above all, Abram had no chance to obtain offspring through Sarai. His device had endangered God’s plan for him.

Cassuto (1974: 351-352) describes the character of Abram’s sins: he had lack of faith, moments of weakness, which made him decide all by himself, and he chose “crooked paths”. By saying that Sarai was his sister, he was speaking half the truth; she was his paternal sister only (Gen. 20: 12).

Be that as it may, Abram experienced a great deal of trouble due to his moment of weakness. One would say that this would teach him not to do such a thing
again (however, see below). But, both he and his son Isaac experience a similar event later (Gen. 20 and 26) under varying circumstances.

Above, three instances are mentioned in which the ancestress is endangered (Gen. 12, 20 and 26). The stories of the “endangered ancestress” belong to a type-scene (see also Wenham 1987: 285). The contents of this type-scene are as follows:

- A husband and wife are in a foreign country.
- Out of fear the husband invents the story of “She’s my sister”.
- After some time the truth is revealed.
- An angry king summons the husband to come, and reminds him of the consequences. “What have you done to me/us?”
- “Reconciliation” takes place, and perhaps healing.
- The husband and his house are sent away, or there is another solution.
- In the end the ancestor is rich.

This type-scene plays an important role in the period when the continued existence of offspring in Abram’s line is in jeopardy (see also Walton and Matthews 1997: 37). It functions “as a literary code, which communicates a specific message or concept” (Gitay 1996: 211). Each type-scene is related to its context, and as such tells a different story, although the relationship with the other type scenes of the same kind remains. The type scene of the endangered ancestress in Gen. 12:

is the most succinct of the three and does everything possible to maximize the force of the story as a foreshadowing of the sojourn in Egypt that will be the fate of Abraham’s progeny... (Alter 1990: 57; see also Sailhamer 1992: 141-143)

In Genesis 26 there is again a famine, but Isaac is not on his way to Egypt. Nonetheless, God tells Isaac to “settle in the land that I shall say to you” (Gen.
26: 2)\textsuperscript{30}, i.e. "this land", Gerar, which is part of the Promised Land (Gen. 26: 3). God repeats his promise to Abram, Isaac and their seed. The pericope is situated between the narratives about the fraternal strife and the selling of the birthright in Gen. 25: 24- 34, and the struggle for the inheritance in Gen. 27. Abimelech's insistence that Isaac must go away, because he had become too powerful (Gen. 26: 16) prepares the way for the parting of ways of Esau and Jacob in Gen. 36: 7 (Alter 1990: 57- 58).

Hence, each starting point is different and we have to take that into account:

Abram grew very old before his son was born. He was tested severely\textsuperscript{31} and must sometimes have been in despair about whether God's promise of offspring in combination with land would ever be fulfilled. That is why this story occurs twice in connection with him. The first time he leaves the Promised Land, the second time he remains in Gerar. In both instances his wife and their progeny are endangered.

Many commentators have looked for the reason that induced Abram to tell Pharaoh, that Sarai was his sister.

Cassuto (1974: 357- 358) writes that Pharaoh dealt in accordance with the laws of Middle Assyria which were also valid in the Fertile Crescent. According to those laws a man, who had conveyed a woman from one place to another had to make an oath that he had not lain with her, as soon as he found out that the woman was married. He also had to pay a fine to the husband. This would explain why Pharaoh gave Abram so many gifts. Cassuto arrives at this conclusion, due

\textsuperscript{30} Intertextuality, i.e. a relationship with Gen. 12: 1, probably induces the translators of the NRSV to translate as follows: "...settle in the land that I shall show you." (Emphasis is mine).

\textsuperscript{31} Gen. 12: 1- 3; 12: 10- 20; 13; 14; 16; 17; 18 and 20.
to his comparison with Gen. 20 in which Abimelech indeed offers possessions to Abram after he realises that Sarai is Abram's wife. But in Gen. 12 Pharaoh gave those gifts before he knew that Sarai was married. That is why I reject Cassuto’s solution in this context.

Speiser (1964: 91-94) on the other hand, writes that the Western Semites “lived in closest cultural symbiosis with Hurrians” (1964: 91). They had adopted many of their customs. One of which was that a brother gave his sister in marriage (Gen. 24: 51). Another was that if a woman only had the status of wife, she had a lower status than a wife who also had the status of her husband’s sister. That is why in a Hurrian society a wife was often also the adopted sister of her husband, with the result that her children would certainly be considered his. According to Gen. 20: 12 Sarai was Abram’s half-sister, with the result that adoption was not necessary. That Abram used Sarai’s status is comprehensible when one considers this background: everybody who is interested in Sarai would have to deal with him, her brother, first. This could prevent problems. But it did not work out well in Genesis 12, although Sarna (1989: 95) claims, that not only in Hebrew, but also in Egyptian, “‘sister’ was used of both sweetheart and wife”. This is food for thought concerning Pharaoh’s behaviour. If Speiser’s hypothesis is right, the very status, which secured Sarai’s children as Abram’s, provided the chance for Sarai’s children to be Pharaoh’s. Indeed, “Here Abram’s plan has completely backfired” (Hamilton 1990: 382).

2.5. Genesis 12: 8-13: 4 as a concentric narrative

Although Genesis 12: 8-9 belong to the preceding paragraph, I have included those two verses in the overview below. I have done so, for verses 8-9 indicate
Abram's position, before his decision to set out for Egypt. He returns to that position after the Egyptian adventure, as can be seen in Genesis 13: 3- 4.32

Genesis 12: 8- 13: 4 is a concentric narrative as can be seen below. A similar concentric shape can be seen in the parallel-text in 1QapGen. I have borrowed this system of elucidation from Fokkelman (1997: 100).

A Abram builds an altar and calls upon the name of the Lord (12: 8)
B Journey to Egypt due to famine (12: 10)
C Abram's device to save his skin and Sarai is taken into Pharaoh's house (12: 11- 14)
D Pharaoh treats Abram well for Sarai's sake (12: 16)
D' The Lord plagues Pharaoh because of Sarai, Abram's wife (12: 17)
C' Pharaoh's device to save his reputation and Sarai is returned from Pharaoh's house (12: 19)
B' Journey out of Egypt due to escort (12: 20- 13: 2)
A' Abram returns to the altar, which he has built before, and there he invokes the name of the Lord (13: 3- 4).

A and A' (Abram builds/rebuilds an altar and invokes the name of the Lord) in this outline indicate that the Egyptian adventure begins and ends with an altar and a prayer.

---

32 Sahlamer's limits of the pericope are: Genesis 12: 10- 13: 4. This is very functional in his comparison with Genesis 41: 54b - Exodus 12: 42. He argues correctly that there is an intentional parallel between those two pericopes, intended to indicate that what God has done with Abram, He has done with his people in Egypt, and so He will deal with his chosen people today and tomorrow (1992: 141- 142).
In the centre of the narrative, D and its parallel D' deal with two opposite powers; Pharaoh and God (Pharaoh finds favour with Abram for Sarai's sake [12: 16]. The Lord plagues Pharaoh because of Sarai, Abram's wife [12: 17]). Pharaoh is known from Exodus as the violator of justice, and as a person who does not mind that his people suffer (Ex. 10: 7-11). He is both the opposite and the opposer of God, who is forbearing, slow to anger, and good. However, the text tells us the opposite: this evil Pharaoh does good things, whereas this good God harms. There is one thing that the two of them share: they both act because of Sarai. And there is the clue to the solution of the above-mentioned problem, for whereas D does not provide any reason why Pharaoh does good, D' shows that God plagues Pharaoh because the latter has kidnapped Abram's wife. Great injustice has been done, and God sets things straight again. That is why He harms Pharaoh, on the other hand, is the origin of injustice. He probably treats Abram well in order to bribe him, or at least to sugar the pill which Abram thinks he must swallow in order to survive.

In B (Journey to Egypt due to famine [12: 10]) it is written, that Abram went down into Egypt to sojourn there for the famine was severe in the land. However, the syntactical structure of Genesis 12: 10, where Abram's name and "Egypt" follow each other immediately, reveals that Abram's destination is Egypt (Gitay 1996: 213-214; and 2.3. A Reading of Genesis 12: 1-13: 4: 63), no matter what happens to Sarai. His place of orientation is changed, and he has moved away from God. Hence, when he goes down to Egypt he is, in reality, morally on the decline. However, in B' this behaviour is corrected; Abram is escorted out of Egypt.

C (Abram's device to save his skin, and Sarai is taken into Pharaoh's house [12: 11-14]) relates the plan, which Abram devised in order to save his skin. Abram
is afraid that the Egyptians will kill him in order to have Sarai for themselves. While fleeing out of fear of nature, Abram realised that he went to sojourn with a nation, which was not related to him, which had a different culture, language, and practices. If Abram were killed he would no longer be able to bear responsibility for Sarai, and the possibility that Sarai would be subjected to the lust of strangers led to Abram’s plan (see 2.3. A Reading of Genesis 12: 1-13: 4: 64).

This brings us to Sarai’s position in the narrative. It is striking that she, the person whose existence this adventure is due to, is only an object in this narrative. It seems as if Abram also considers her an object, for all he cares for is his own life. Sarai’s status (identity) must be concealed in order that he may live. In one aspect Abram’s plan works well. His life is saved. But Sarai’s fate is sealed. This is described by means of a climax; not only the Egyptians see that she is beautiful, so do Pharaoh’s princes (principes), who praise her, with the result that she is taken into Pharaoh’s house (Gen. 12: 14-15). Sarai’s distress must have been immense, but the narrator relates nothing about it. On the contrary, in D (Pharaoh treats Abram well for Sarai’s sake [12: 16]) he tells that Pharaoh made Abram a rich man. This leads to the following observation: although Abram begins and ends his adventure with sacrifices and a prayer to God, in reality Abram has made a monstrous covenant with Pharaoh, who gets Sarai on condition that Abram is left to live, and on the condition that Pharaoh gilds Abram’s pill by means of cattle, slaves and animals of transport!

This agreement is an injustice that cannot be tolerated by the Lord. Hence, He reverses the course of the narrative in D’, and plagues Pharaoh because of Sarai (Gen.12: 17). Then a sequence of events, positive to Sarai, takes place. In C’ she is returned (Gen.12: 19). In B’ she and Abram are escorted out of Egypt (Gen. 12:
20- 13: 2), and in A' Abram re-establishes his relationship with God (Abram returns to the altar, which he has built before, and there he invokes the name of the Lord [13: 3- 4]).

In retrospect the following conclusion can be made: Abram’s re-orientation in B without God’s consent is his big mistake. The result is that he remains out of balance; subsequently he does not have control over his own life anymore, and he becomes dependent on others. Abram should have kept his eyes fixed upon the Promised Land. The fact that he no longer has control over his own life can be seen in C, D, D', C', and B' in the outline. Others become the acting persons:

In B he travels to Egypt due to the fear of nature. In B' he travels out of Egypt due to the escort, which Pharaoh supplies to get rid of him. Since God is the One who reversed the plot, it is obvious that He made Pharaoh provide for Abram’s escort out of Egypt. In this way He helps Abram realise that the fear of God is far more sensible than the fear of nature (Gitay 1996: 209), which leads to unacceptable compromises. Abram reacts favourably to this forced return to the Promised Land, where he is a sojourner once again, but full of the confidence, which God has given him by means of His promise. He goes back on his steps, back to the altar which he built in Gen. 12: 8. His return to this altar and his prayer in A' indicate that Abram realises that the Lord has helped him all the way, so that he may be confident that he will not perish if he continues his relationship with Him. His return via the same route as the one he used in order to leave the land of the famine indicates that.
2.6. The Relationship between God and Abram

In the comparison of *Genesis* 12 with the similar story in the *Genesis Apocryphon* the relationship between God and Abram is of utmost importance. Therefore, I will shed more light upon that relationship here.

Westermann (1995: 29) states that the Abraham narratives are often concerned with life and death. Sarah’s barreness and Abraham’s childlessness would eventually lead to the end of the family in Abraham’s line. This is exactly the reason why God’s promise of progeny is so important in the narrative. Moreover, God will not only provide offspring, He will also give it a Land as a home.

Cassuto describes Abraham’s ten trials in his commentary on *Genesis* (1964: 294-296) as follows:

1. The migration from his country, kindred and father’s house to a new land, unknown to him (Gen. 12: 1-4).
2. The famine, which compels him to leave the Promised Land and go down to Egypt where Sarai and the promise of offspring are in danger (Gen. 12: 10-20).
3. The separation from Lot (Gen. 13).
4. The fight against the kings (Gen. 14).
5. The strife in the family due to the conception of Hagar’s son (Gen. 16).
6. The circumcision (Gen. 17).
7. Lot in jeopardy, Abraham’s trust in God tested (Gen. 18).
8. Sarah endangered in Gerar (Gen. 20).

---

33 I use the name “Abraham”, which is Abram’s name from *Genesis* 17: 5 onward, because that is the name by which he is usually denoted.
9. The departure of the first-born son (Gen. 21).
10. The offering of Isaac (Gen. 22).

After each trial Abraham “receives consolation in the form of a renewed assurance by God, or of a specific act for his benefit” (1964: 294). In the pericope under study God promises Canaan to Abram’s offspring and He illustrates His resolution by liberating Sarai from Pharaoh’s house.

After Lot, who was the only male relative living with Abram, and who could be considered his heir, leaves Abram, God promises Abram that both he and his innumerable progeny will inherit Canaan (Gen. 13: 15-16). God repeats this in Gen. 15: 2-6 and confirms it by means of a covenant. Not only the son of Sarai, but also the son of Hagar will have an innumerable offspring (Gen. 16: 10 and 17: 21).

After Abraham’s trust in God is tested, God saves his nephew Lot and his daughters by sending them out of Sodom (Gen. 19: 1-29). Sarah is endangered a second time, but God fulfils his promise, and she bears Isaac (Gen. 21: 1-3). Watching Ishmael play with Isaac, induces Sarah to decide that it is time for Hagar and her son to leave. They wander about in the desert, but God saves them (Gen. 21: 8-20). After the binding of Isaac, an angel repeats the promises which God has made to Abraham, including one of the first blessings in Gen. 12: 3, i.e. that his progeny will be a blessing to the nations of the world, because Abraham has obeyed the Lord (Gen. 22: 18). Herewith, the sequence of the ten trials comes to an end.
2.7. The Message of the Text

The famine in Canaan was a phenomenon which Abram probably did not expect after God’s promises of Land and offspring. It is possible that Abram thought that the famine indicated that the promises would not be effected. This made him forget his calling (Gen. 12: 1- 4). Consequently, he started looking for solutions to his problems (Gen. 12: 10- 13), but in the process he endangered the promises (see 2.3. A Reading of Genesis 12: 1- 13: 4: 67). Hence, the story implies that Abram’s neglect of his calling is the result of misunderstanding. Moreover, the neglect of his calling causes misfortune to fellow people, in casu Sarai. However, God is merciful, and puts him on the right track again, possibly to compensate for the damage he has done to others.

2.8. Inventory of the Problems in the Pericope

Certain problems, found in Gen. 12: 1- 13: 4, have also been dealt with in the Genesis Apocryphon and in the Book of Jubilees. They are the subject matter of this dissertation, in which the solutions to these problems are compared. The problems are as follows:

- The nature of the divine self-disclosure in Genesis 12: 1 and 7 is unclear (2.3.)
- The journey to Egypt is undertaken on Abram’s own account (2.3.)
- The structure of Genesis 12: 10 indicates that Abram’s destination is Egypt (2.3.)
- The endangered ancestress type- scene, and its origin (2.3.)
- Abram seems to be ready to sacrifice his wife, who was infertile anyway, and the promise in order to survive (2.3.)
- God compensates Sarai (2.5.)
• Sarai, whose existence this adventure is due to, has no say, nor is anything said about her distress (2.3.)
• Pharaoh’s role in the adventure (2.2.3: 46, and 2.3.)
• The origin of Abram’s richness (2.3.)
• The problem of childlessness and heritage: Abram might have considered Lot to be his heir (2.3, and 2.6.).
CHAPTER THREE - A COMMENTARY ON THE GENESIS APOCRYPHON XIX: 7- XXI: 4

The most important readings of the *Genesis Apocryphon* available are (in order of publication) those of Avigad and Yadin (1956); Fitzmyer (1971); Jongeling, Labuschagne and Van der Woude (1976); and Beyer (1984).

Fitzmyer has restored the text according to the corresponding text in the biblical book of *Genesis*, similar lines in *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon*, and passages in other biblical books, which improves the readability of the text. He admits that the restoration is sometimes quite conjectural (see e.g. 1971: 107, *at that time*). Another drawback is that Fitzmyer does not use diacritical signs, with the result that in some instances the impression is created that a reading is certain when in fact it is tenuous.

Jongeling, Labuschagne and Van der Woude's text supplies several new readings in comparison with Fitzmyer's edition, but unfortunately also lacks diacritical signs.

Similar to Avigad and Yadin's edition, Beyer's reading contains diacritical signs, that elucidate which letters are certain and which are not. Beyer's above-mentioned edition contributes a great deal to the text, and is very ingenious. Qimron (1992: 13) writes about it:

> Several suggestions are supported by both the traces and by the context or language, while some which are not, should be given as restorations rather than as part of the surviving text. Some others which do not fit either the traces or the context should be rejected entirely.

Fitzmyer's reading is the best in comparison with the other versions. That is why I have decided to use his translation in the second, revised edition of his commentary on the *Genesis Apocryphon* as the basis of my translation. Where I disagree with his translation, or with his Aramaic version of the text I have printed
my version in bold. The italics in the translation are Fitzmyer's, and indicate a literal Aramaic translation of the Hebrew text of *Genesis* (1971: 49).

**3.1. The Place of the Pericope in the Last Four Columns**

The manuscript contains several vacats in the text, which "indicate four chapters and several subunits in the last four columns of the scroll" (Lange 1996: 192). They can be seen on the photographs in the *editio princeps* of Avigad and Yadin (AY). Lange (1996: 192) describes the above-mentioned four chapters as follows:

- XVIII: 25- XXI: 4 Abram's journey and his adventure in Egypt.
- XXI: 5- 22 Abram staying in the land.
- XXI: 23- XXII: 26 Abram at war.
- XXII: 27- ... Abram and ...

The pericope under study is 1QapGen XIX: 7- XXI: 4. This forms the readable part of the chapter about Abram's journey and his adventure in Egypt of which the first lines are missing. Thus, the reader must keep in mind that the first three lines describing the contents of the narrative in the following overview are hypothetical. The chapter is subdivided by the following vacats (again I follow Lange 1996: 193):

- XVIII: 25- ... The call of Abram and God's first promise to him.
- XVIII: ...- ... The departure from Mesopotamia.
- ...- ... Abram in Bethel.
- XIX: ...- 10 Abram's journey to Hebron.
- XIX: 10- 13 The famine in Canaan and the journey to Egypt.
- XIX: 14- 17 Abram's dream.
- XIX: 17- XX: 11 Interpretation and fulfilment of the dream.
XIX: 17-31 The interpretation of the dream and the visit of the three princes.

XIX: 31-XX: 11 The return of the princes, their report of Sarai’s beauty, Sarai’s kidnapping.

XX: 12-21 Abram’s prayer and the plague of the Pharaoh.

XX: 21-23 Horqonwash’s second visit and his demand for help.

XX: 24-XXI: 4 The cure of the Pharaoh, the wealth and return of Abram.

XX: 24-32 The cure of the Pharaoh, the restitution of Sarai and the delivery of the presents.


The following version is based upon Fitzmyer’s text. I have changed it where I considered this necessary. The changes have been underlined in the Aramaic text, and indicated with bold letters in the translation. An account of these changes can be found in the notes in this chapter (3.5: 99).
לפוחת על זה:
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3.3. The Translation of the *Genesis Apocryphon* XIX: 7- XXI: 4.

In the translation the original vacats can be discerned\textsuperscript{31}, although they are not text-immanent. By means of asterisks I have divided the text into text-immanent sections.

[ ] indicate lacunae in the *Vorlage*. Material between square brackets is conjectural.

( ) indicate matter added for the sake of the sense of the English translation.

Italics indicate a literal Aramaic translation of the Hebrew text of *Genesis* (1971: 49). The changes I made have been indicated with bold letters.

*Column XIX*

... 

7  [...] and I built there an altar, and [I called on the name of G]o[...] ther[e ...], and I said, "You are indeed

8  to [me the eternal] [Go]d[...]. Up till now I had not reached the holy mountain; so I set out

9  for [ ...] and I kept going *southward* [ ...] and I went [ ...] until I reached Hebron. At [that time] Hebron was built and I dwelt

10  [two ye]ars [there].

10*  \textit{Now there was a famine in all this land; but I heard that [there was] gr[ai]n in Egypt. So I set out}

11  to [enter] the land of Egypt [ ...] which [ ...], and \textit{it came to pass that}

I arrived at the Carmon River, one of the

---

\textsuperscript{31} See Lange 1996: 194, who states that only in 1QapGen XVIII: 25- XIX: 10 and XX: 33- XXI: 4 the text-immanent and the vacat-structure are identical. He concludes on the grounds of this, that the author of this pericope has inserted an "Abram-narrative" into an itinerary in order to interpret a third text, "the biblical text of the Thora" (1996: 196). He concludes that this text is a haggadic midrash, the purpose of which is didactic (1996: 197. See my discussion of the genre in 1.3.3. *The Genre and Name of the Scroll*: 22). Lange's study is form-critical, and therefore does not fit in with the
heads of the River [    ]. Now we [ ] our land (?), and I [crossed the
seven heads of this river, which

[    ] Now we crossed (the border of) our land and entered the land of
the sons of Ham, the land of Egypt.

And I, Abram, dreamt a dream in the night of my
entering into the land of Egypt, and I saw in my dream [and look], a cedar
and a date-palm (which was)

[very beautiful]; and some men came intending to cut down and uproot the
cedar, but leave the date-palm by itself.

Now the date-palm shouted and said, "Do not cut down the cedar for we
are both from one family." So the cedar was left (alone) with the help of
the date-palm,

and [it was] not [cut down].

(That) night I awoke from my sleep and said to Sarai my wife, "I
have dreamt a dream,

[and I] am frightened by this dream." She said to me, "Tell me your dream
that I may know (it too)". So I began to tell her this dream;

[and I told] her the interpretation of this] dream, [and] s[aid], "[    ]
who will seek to kill me and leave you (alone) [    ] but this is all the favor
[that you must do for me]; whe[ver we shall be, say] about me, 'He's
my brother.' Then I shall live with your help and my soul will be spared
because of you.

[    ] they will seek] to [take] you away from me and to kill me." And
Sarai wept at my words that night.

[    ], and Pharaoh Zo[an ... so that] Sarai [no longer wished] to go
toward Zoan

synchronical method, which I use in this dissertation.
[with me, for she feared very much in her soul, lest any [one] should see her [ ].

And after those five years

three of the princes of Egypt [came ] of the Pharaoh Zoan concerning [my] words and my wife. They gave [me numerous gifts and asked of me] kindness, and wisdom, and truth. And I read before them the [book] of the Words of [En]och (?)

[ ] about the famine which [ ].. and not [ ] and they came to the place(?) in order to [ ] to her [ ] the words of [ ] with much eating and [much] drinking [ ] the wine

[ ]

[ ]

[ ] eat (?) [ ]

[ ]

[ ]

[ ]

[ ] 35

[ ]

[ ]

[ ]

[ ]

[ ]

[ ]

[ ]

Column XX

1  [ ][ ]

2  ["... ... ] how splen[did] and beautiful the form of her face, and how

3  [ ... ... ] and how soft the hair of her head; how lovely are her eyes, and how desirable is her nose, and all the radiance

4  of her face [ ]; how lovely is her breast and how beautiful all her whiteness!

Her arms, how beautiful! And her hands, how

35 Here is the vacat in the scroll, but it is impossible to discern what is written before and after the vacat. See also Lange 1996: 193. However, on page 195, Lange subdivides the text at "about" (approximately) line 30. The reason for this is not clear to me.
perfect! And (how) [attractive]tive all the appearance of her hands! How lovely (are) her hands, palms, and how long and dainty all the fingers of her hands. Her feet,

how beautiful! And how perfect are her legs! There are no virgins or brides who go up to a bridal chamber more beautiful than she. Indeed, her beauty surpasses that of all women; her beauty is high above all of them. Yet with all this beauty there is much wisdom in her; and whatever she has

is lovely."

When the king heard the words of Horqonwash and the words of his two companions --for the three of them spoke with one mouth-- he loved her very much, and he sent off

in haste (and) had her brought (to him). When he beheld her, he marvelled at all her beauty, and took her to himself as a wife. He sought to kill me, but Sarai said

to the king, "He's my brother", while I was negotiating about what concerned her. And I, Abram, was left alone on account of her, and I was not killed. But I wept

bitterly --I, Abram, and Lot, my brother's son, with me-- on the night when Sarai was taken away from me by force.

That night I prayed, and I entreated, and I asked for mercy; and I said in sorrow, as my tears ran down, "Blessed you, O God Most High, my Lord, for all

ages! For You are the Lord and Ruler over all, and you have power to mete out justice to all the kings of the earth. And now

I lodge my complaint with you, my Lord, against the Pharaoh Zoon, the king of Egypt, that he has taken my wife away from me by force. Mete out justice to him for me and show forth your great hand
against him and against all his house. May he not have power to defile my wife from me tonight—that it may be known about you, my Lord, that you are the Lord of all the kings of
the earth." And I wept, and was silent.

That night God Most High sent him a pestilential spirit to afflict him and all the men of his house, an evil spirit,
that kept afflicting him and all the men of his house. And he was not able to touch her, much less did he know her, though she was with him
for two years. At the end of two years the plagues and afflictions held him firmly, and prevailed over him and over all the men of his house. So he sent
for all the [wise men] of Egypt, and all the enchanters, and all the physicians of Egypt (to find out) if they could cure him of this plague, and the men
of his house. But none of the physicians, the enchanters, nor any of the wise men were able to rise up and cure him, for it came to pass that the spirit afflicted all of them
and they fled.

Thereupon Horqonwash came to me and begged me to come and pray for
the king, and lay my hands upon him that he might live, for [he had seen me] in a dream. But Lot said to him, "Abram, my uncle, cannot pray for
the king while Sarai, his wife, is with him. Now be gone, tell the king that he should send his wife away from him, to her husband. Then he will pray for him that he might live."

When Horqonwash heard Lot's words, he went, (and) said to the king, "All these plagues and afflictions
with which my lord, the king, is plagued and afflicted (are) for the sake of Sarai, the wife of Abram. Let them return Sarai, I pray, to Abram, her husband,

and he will drive out this plague from you, as well as the spirit of purulence."

26* So he summoned me to him, and said to me: "What have you done to me, why have you repeatedly said

to me: 'She's my sister', when she was your wife? And I took her to me as wife! Look, your wife; take her away, be gone, and depart from

all the provinces of Egypt. But now, pray for me and for my house that this evil spirit may be cast out from us." So I prayed [that] he [be] cured..., And I laid my hands upon his [he]ad, and the plague was removed from him and the evil [spirit] was cast out [from him], and he lived. And the king rose (and) [made] known
to me [ ]; and the king swore an oath to me that [he had] not [touched her?]. And look, [they brought]

Sarai to [me]. And the king gave her much [silver and gold]; numerous garments of fine linen and purple [... and he laid them]

before her, and Hagar too. And he hand[ed] her over to me, and appointed men who would escort me [out of Egypt].

33* So I, Abram, went (forth) with very numerous flocks and with silver and gold too, and I went up from [Egypt]. [And] Lot,

my brother's son, (was) with me, and Lot too (had) acquired numerous flocks; and he had taken for himself a wife from the daughters [of Egypt]. And I [camp]ped over and over again [with him]
Column XXI
1 [at] every place of my encampments, until I reached Bethel, the place where I had built an altar, and I built it again.
2 And I offered upon it holocausts and an offering to God Most High, and there I called upon the name of the Lord of the ages, and I praised the name of God, and I blessed 
3 God. And I gave thanks there before God for all the flocks and the good things which He had given me; because He had done good to me; and because He had brought me back 
4 to this land in safety.

3.4. An Outline of the Pericope
The pericope of the Genesis Apocryphon from XIX: 7 till XXI: 4 is shaped concentrically as can be seen in the following overview:

A Abram builds an altar and there calls on the name of God (XIX: 7-8)
B Journey southward (XIX: 8-10)
C The journey to Egypt and the dream (XIX: 10-23)
D The princes' visit and gifts (XIX: 23-?)
E Sarai is praised, Pharaoh loves her, and takes her for himself (?)-XX: 9)
F Pharaoh seeks to kill Abram (XX: 9)
G Sarai saves Abram by saying, "He's my brother" (XX: 9-10)
H Abram, in sorrow, prays, entreats, asks for mercy, and says... (XX: 10-16)
I Abram realises that he has to do with a power greater than himself, he weeps and is silent (XX: 16)
J God in action (XX: 16-18)
J' The Egyptian healers in contra- action (XX: 18-21)
The Egyptian healers realise that they have to do with a Power greater than they, and they flee (XX: 21)

Inspired by a dream Horqonwash begs Abram to come and pray, and lay his hands upon Pharaoh (XX: 21-22)

After the facts have become clear Pharaoh asks Abram why he has said "She's my sister", although she was his wife (XX: 22-28)

Abram prays for Pharaoh and he lives (XX: 28-29)

Pharaoh makes known and swears that he has not known Sarai, and he returns her to Abram (XX: 29-31)

Pharaoh gives gifts to Sarai (XX: 31-32)

Escort out of Egypt (XX: 32-34)

Journey to Bethel (XX: 34-XXI:1)

Abram rebuilds the altar and sacrifices; there he invokes God's name; praises, blesses, and thanks God (XXI:1-4)

The story is a self-contained entity in a circular form, beginning and ending with the same event; Abram building an altar for God near Bethel, where he brings sacrifices to Him. However, a closer look at the two events indicated by means of A and A' shows that Abram is extremely happy and relieved in A', whereas his attitude is more sober in A. The reason for this difference can be found in Abram's Egyptian adventure related in the pericope.

B relates the journey through the Promised Land. Abram is journeying towards the South, and settles in Hebron where he lives for two years until a famine occurs. Abram learns that there is grain in Egypt, and decides to exchange the Promised Land for Egypt. In B' Abram returns to Canaan via the same route as the one of his journey towards Egypt.
In C Abram travels to the Land of the Sons of Ham (XIX: 13), where there is plenty of water. During the first night in Egypt Abram has a frightening dream about two trees belonging to one family, who have to stand together to survive. Abram explains this dream to his wife Sarai, and asks her to cooperate with his plan to survive in this strange land. Everywhere, she must deny her marriage to Abram, and instead, say that he is her brother. Sarai cries, and decides that it is best to hide. In C' Abram returns to Canaan escorted by Pharaoh's men. In C' there is no speech of plenty of water, but both Abram and Lot are very rich. Lot, the son of Abram's brother, is married.

D indicates, that after five years of a quiet life in Egypt, three Egyptian princes pay a visit to Abram and Sarai. They bring many gifts. In return Abram offers kindness, wisdom, truth, and hospitality (XIX: 25-?). In D' Sarai receives many gifts from Pharaoh and is returned to Abram. In return, the couple leaves the country, escorted by Pharaoh's men.

The ending of D and the beginning of E do not exist anymore, but it is clear that the princes have seen Sarai. Consequently, in E they praise her before Pharaoh, who abducts her. In E' Pharaoh swears solemnly that he has not had sexual intercourse with Sarai, after which he returns her to Abram. Hence, the horrible event in E is nullified in E'.

The opposite of Pharaoh's attempt to kill Abram in F can be seen in F'; instead of making plans to kill his antagonist, Abram prays for his life. In G the author, who suggests that he is Abram by writing in the first person singular, describes Sarai's lie: "He's my brother". In G' Lot exposes this saying as a lie. Then Pharaoh asks Abram why he has said: "She's my sister", thus accusing him of insincerity.

In H Abram asks for mercy, and pleads to God that He might intervene with the result that people will acknowledge that He is the Lord of all the kings. In H' God indeed shows His mercy. Horqonwash, inspired by God's dream, pleads to Abram
to come, pray, and be an instrument of healing. Hence, Horqonwash acknowledges God's greatness. Well aware of his powerlessness Abram takes refuge in silence in I, whereas the Egyptians flee the prevailing spirit in I'.

The centre of the story (I/II') is one of action and contra- action. God intervenes by means of a pestilential spirit. The Egyptians called in to heal Pharaoh and his house, and not knowing which Power they are fighting against, are overcome by It when they are in Pharaoh's house. They flee in panic, for the Power prevails over them. This event forms the pivot of the narrative. God reveals Himself exactly as Abram has described Him in XX: 12-16. Moreover, He reveals that He is faithful to His plan with Abram, and does not allow humans to disturb it. What Abram prays in XX: 15, i.e. "...that it may be known about you, my Lord, that you are the Lord of all the kings of the earth!"", comes true when Pharaoh, Horqonwash, all the wise men of Egypt, all the enchanters, and all the physicians of Egypt acknowledge His power and justice. This is important, for Pharaoh and his house are presented as the co-workers of Satan. They do not know God, and do not want to acknowledge Him, but in the end they cannot resist his power. The author presents them as immoral beings in accordance with the Egyptians in the Exodus narrative in order to under- expose Abram's indecent attitude towards Sarai.

The fact that God plays a pivotal role in this pericope leads to the conclusion that He is the main character of the narrative, even though He does not act in the foreground. Abram's prayer in A' reflects his acknowledgement and his gratitude towards God whom he has come to know better by this adventure.
3.5. Text-critical and Philological Notes on 1QapGen XIX: 7- XXI: 4

**Column XIX**

7 The place to which the text refers is probably Bethel, for the parallel text Gen. 12: 8 mentions it as the second place where Abram built an altar. The first place where he built an altar was Elon Moreh, which was probably related in the lacuna before XIX: 7 (Fitzmyer 1971: 105).

The text of line 7 reconstructed by Fitzmyer is thus: [םִּחְיָה] אֹלְּמִּים מִדֶּשֶׁה [אֹלְּמִים מִדֶּשֶׁה]. Beyer (1984: 171) reads it as follows: [אֹלְּמִים מִדֶּשֶׁה] אֹלְּמִים מִדֶּשֶׁה. The three last words are identical, but what precedes is very different. Whereas Fitzmyer has reconstructed the text according to the *Genesis Apocryphon* XXI: 1, Beyer has reconstructed the text in a very creative manner: Sarai is immediately introduced saying that her interlocutor (Abram?) is dreaming, "denn bis jetzt hast du den heiligen Berg noch nicht erreicht" (1984: 171). Beyer's text contains several circles and square brackets to indicate that this is conjecture. Since the CD-Rom, which I used to read the scroll, is not clear I prefer Fitzmyer's reconstruction.

8 Due to the missing passages, it is not possible to establish the end of the direct speech. However, Jongeling, Labuschagne and Van der Woude, who have restored lines 7- 8 on the basis of col. XXI: 1f., Gen. 12: 8 and Jub. 13: 8, have:

*and I built there an altar, I called there upon the name of God and I said: 'You are (8) my God, God eternal'. And there I praised and blessed the Lord of all ages. Up till then I had not reached the holy mountain; so I set out...* (1976: 87- 89, italics are theirs)

36 Henceforth JL.VdW.
In Fitzmyer's reading of XIX: 8 the conjecture of JLVdW "And there I praised and blessed the Lord of all ages" does not occur. Consequently, the contrast between the beginning and the end of the pericope, i.e. XIX: 7-10 and XX: 33-XXI: 4, in his version is greater than in the one of JLVdW. This is due to the long lacuna in this line of the scroll where only a few letters are readable.

- The ה in is a *signum accusativi* used to express the direct object. See Rowley (1929: 103, chap. XI 3b); Bauer and Leander (1962: 335, §100), and Fitzmyer (1971: 106).

- It is not certain which mountain is the holy mountain. It is not Shechem, where Elon Moreh was, since Abram had passed there already. It is more likely that it was situated on the road to Hebron, which is mentioned in line 9.

9 JLVdW consider the holy mountain to be Moria. They have inserted that name after the initial letter ה in XIX: 9 (1976: 89). This identification is based upon the fact that in the Hebrew Bible, Jerusalem, the city of Mount Moria, is usually meant by "holy mountain", or "my holy mountain". (See Is. 11: 9; 56: 7; 57: 13; 65: 11; 66: 20; Jer. 31: 23; Ez. 28: 14; Joel 2: 1; 4: 17, etc.) However, Fitzmyer considers it difficult to determine what location is meant by this phrase. He refers to a corresponding passage in Jubilees 13: 5 (1971: 106).

- Beyer (1984: 171) reads "Und ich ging...", before יָדָת, where Fitzmyer leaves an empty space after a separate ר. Beyer's version is possible, although the last two letters are almost invisible on CD-Rom. I have inserted it into Fitzmyer's text.

---

Henceforth BL.
- "until I reached Hebron" corresponds only to "and he came to Hebron" in Jub. 13: 10, which shows its affinity to the tradition of *Jubilees* (Fitzmyer 1971: 107).

- Beyer (1984: 171) reads (?) instead of וֹלֵב הַיָּמִים. Both the microfiche and the CD-Rom were not clear enough to decide which of the readings is the best. In Beyer's version the city of Hebron does not yet exist; in Fitzmyer's it is being built. Fitzmyer's version is in agreement with Jub. 13: 12, which is related to 1QapGen. The tradition that Hebron is seven years older than Zoan (Tanis) is based upon *Numbers* 13: 22 (Fitzmyer 1971: 107 and Schulman 1971: 1142).

- Hebron means "association" or "league" (BDB 1979: 289a). It was situated at the northern side of the Wadi el Chalil where the cave in the field of Machpelah, which Abraham bought from Ephron the Hittite, was also situated (Gen. 23, and GVI 1958: 390).

- Abram and Sarai lived in Hebron for two years. It was probably a pleasant place with enough food for them and their cattle. Gen. 23 tells us that Sarah died there. The fact that Abraham indicated from whom he wanted to buy the cave in the field nearby, for Sarah's burial, shows that he knew the region and its inhabitants (Gen. 23: 7-9).

10 Beyer (1984: 171) reads the first three words of line 10 in a reversed word order. This is in agreement with Ginsberg. See, however, Fitzmyer's refutation (1971: 107: 10).

10* Fitzmyer notes that "We meet here for the first time the literal translation of a few words from the Hebr. text of Gn. 12.10", וֹלֵב הַיָּמִים.
Beyer (1984: 171) reads [ן]הֶבְנָא, "großer Überfluß", instead of [ן]הָבֵן. His reading is very beautifully put as a contrast to "famine". Moreover, in this pericope one sees the word הָבֵן occur often in connection with Egypt. Examples thereof are: XIX: 25, 27 (2x); XX: 8, 31 (2x), 33, 34. Egypt certainly appears to be a country of plenty. However, the remnants of a resh and an aleph are visible on CD-Rom. Hence, Fitzmyer's version is the best. Moreover, his version is more to the point. It does not deal with abundance, but with absence of food, and thus the danger of death, in Canaan.

Muraoka (1972: 12) pleads for Ginsberg's reading, [ן]הֶבְנָא. Muraoka does so firstly, since this "reading is supported by the parallel Gen. 42, 2 TO..., TN..., and Peshitta...; and secondly the introduction of the pf. HW' is unjustified" (1972: 12-13) since "As in most Semitic languages, the subordinate nominal clause ... may remain indifferent to time distinctions" (1972: 27)\(^38\) This is, however, more a matter of restoration of the text than that it has impact upon the meaning of it, and the text is too unclear to decide which reading is the best.

"Famine in all this land". Rabinowitz’s opening words in his article "Famine and drought" (1971: 1172) are: "Since agriculture in Erez Israel was dependent on irregular rainfall, drought and consequent famine were of frequent occurrence".

"Famine in all this land". The word "all" does not occur in Gen. 12: 10, and can thus be considered an intervention by the author of the Genesis Apocryphon. It seems as if he wanted to condone Abram’s behaviour, and that he wanted to stress that Abram and Sarai did not have a choice, but to

---

38 TO stands for Targum Onkelos, and TN for Targum Neofiti.
leave the Promised Land. It was not only they who had to leave it due to famine, so did Isaac (Gen. 26: 1-6) and Elimelech (Ruth 1: 1-2). It is interesting to see, that in later times "the rabbis permitted emigration from Erez Israel in the case of famine, but only when it reached serious proportions (Bava Batra 91b; Gen. R. 25 end)" (Rabinowitz 1971: 1174). The roots of this rabbinical tradition might be traced back to the period when the Genesis Apocryphon was depicted.

"but I had heard that [there was] grain in Egypt." These words are reminiscent of Gen. 42: 2, so that an association could have been made between:

the famine in Canaan in the days of Abram when there was plenty in Egypt with the famine in Canaan in the days of Joseph when there was plenty in Egypt. (Bernstein 1996: 48)

Bernstein calls this an associative harmonisation (1996: 48).

I have added "it came to pass that" to Fitzmyer's translation to render the translation more literal. See also XX: 20.

Beyer (1984: 172) reads the beginning of this sentence thus: לָּא [רָּ֥מָה] הָוַ֖י, "to go into" (Jastrow 1903: 350a and 216a). This is an interesting description of Abram's situation, since Beyer's reading leaves no room whatsoever for the meaning "ascend" (עָלֵּיהֶם, with -ל, Jastrow 1903: 1083b), in contrast to Fitzmyer's reading and the one of Gen. 12. However, the prevailing meaning of Fitzmyer's עָלֵיהֶם is also clearly "to enter", as can be seen in Jastrow (1903: 1083b). The author replaces the original verb רָּ֥מָה, "to descend" as used in Gen. 12: 10, by the verb "to enter" as used in Gen. 12: 11, which makes Abram's behaviour look more innocent than meant by the
author of Genesis (see 2.2.3. Notes: 51). However, the text is too damaged to be able to discern which reading is the best.

JLVdW have אנה instead of אנה (1976: 89). This would run parallel with XIX: 9. However, it is more likely that there is an aleph at the end of the word than a yod, since the remnants of the lower part of an aleph can be discerned.

Beyer (1984: 172) reads Narmon, instead of Carmon. The text on the scroll does not give up the secret of the best reading. Both Narmon and Carmon are names unknown in the tradition. Fitzmyer (1971: 109) thinks that the author of 1QapGen identifies the Carmon with the east branch of the Nile Delta, since Egypt is mentioned in this line, provided that this could be the river which forms the border of "our land".

Beyer (1984: 172) begins the second part of this line with: מנה כהן אלהים המפרשים, adding in his translation the following "Bis jetzt sind wir noch innerhalb unseres Landes". In order to make his reading logical he adds before this passage "[...Und ich sagte zu Sarai:]" at the beginning of line 13. This interpretation should be rejected. Both בים and ריב are not discernable on the scroll. Moreover, it has a forced character due to the interpolation "...Und ich sagte zu Sarai:". Furthermore, where Abram has obtained this knowledge is not clear. It is only in column XXI of the Genesis Apocryphon that Abram gets to know the extent of the Promised Land when God shows it to him.

Dupont-Sommer (1961: 286) writes:

As in Jubilees, the Nile is considered here as forming the frontier between Israel and Egypt. The 'seven arms' of the Delta are also mentioned by HERODOTUS (II, 17); here, the river Karmon seems to be the most easterly arm.
"our land"! If this is the correct reading, the author depicts Abram as a person, whose faith is so great, that he already speaks of Canaan as "our land", although the promise of a son has not yet come true. Fitzmyer (1971: 59 and 110) considers this a very doubtful reading. However, "our land" also occurs in XIX: 13.

Both Fitzmyer (1971: 59 and 110) and Dupont-Sommer (1961: 286) add a word for "border" in their translations in order to express the idea of exchanging or passing through the land; the former adds "border", the latter, "boundary".

"The land of the sons of Ham". Gen. 10: 6 and 1QapGen XII: 11 (GQ 1992: 73) mention Cush, Mizraim, Put and Canaan as Ham's sons, whereas Grosheide and Van Itterzon VI (1957: 144–145)indicate that the land and the tents of Ham in Psalms 78: 53, 105: 23, 27 and 106: 22 refer to Egypt. Fitzmyer remarks correctly (1971: 110): "the appositive makes it clear that by the time when this text was written only Egypt was understood by this designation." The name Ham augurs ill, since Genesis 9 relates that Ham was the son who talked about Noah's nakedness when Noah was drunk. Ham's son Canaan was cursed for that reason. Here we are confronted with the descendants of Ham's son Mizraim (i.e. Egypt), who, although Mizraim was not cursed, also function as a bad omen, simply because they are Ham's descendants. Unfortunately, the present Genesis Apocryphon does not provide this tale. In 1QapGen XII: 13 the story about the vineyard starts, and in XII: 15 Noah starts drinking of the wine, but due to many lacunae further on in the column the rest of the version of 1QapGen is unknown (See GQ 1992: 73).

39 Grosheide and Van Itterzon; henceforth GVI.
"I, Abram" is the first allusion to the speaking person in this pericope. The narrator still uses his original name, which was changed to Abraham in Gen. 17: 5. "Abram" means "the father is exalted". Westermann, however, explains this in his commentary on *Genesis* (1985: 84-86) as "God is exalted".

"dreamt a dream"; Fitzmyer translates "had a dream" (see also XIX: 17). The origin of the dream is never ascribed to God. However, this is certainly the implication. In the literature of the Hebrew Bible, dreams function as a means of representing the contact between God and a human being (Gnuse 1996: 68). Dehandschutter (1974: 48) argues that this is also the case in the *Genesis Apocryphon*. It is an obvious addition to the biblical story in order to explain why Sarai will have to tell a lie to cover up Abram's real identity. (See also Knibb 1994: 190.) Visotzky writes that the problem of Abram's moral ambiguity towards Sarai is not solved in this passage. It is only the dream which is solved and "the blame is shifted to the giver of dreams, God" (1996: 59). Moreover, the fact that Abram did not consult God before he left the Promised Land also remains a problem.

Dehandschutter (1974: 49) argues that the concept vision is more applicable to what is described as a פְּלִפֵּר in verse 14ff. Words such as פְּלִפֵּר and פְּלִפָּה in XIX: 14, and פְּלִפָּה in XIX: 16 indeed refer to what Abram sees. On the other hand, one can state that the author applies the word dream, since it takes place at night (XIX: 14) while Abram sleeps (XIX: 17). Moreover, Gnuse remarks that both in the Near East and in the Bible, the distinction between dreams and other forms of revelation, amongst them visions, was vague. The only criteria by which one can distinguish a dream "are the stylized formulas which denote a dream as such" (Gnuse 1996: 35). It is also
suggested "that visions came in a waking state..., but dreams occurred in sleep" (1996: 70). The latter might be the reason why the word הַשְּׁכִיָּה is used in this text (see Appendix C for background information about the dream). In my Analysis of the Narrative in 3.7: 182, I intend to show that the dream in 1QapGen contains the above-mentioned stylised formulas.

- Avigad and Yadin (1956: 41) read המְלַלְמוֹ "our entering" instead of המְלַלְמַה "my entering". The last two letters, however, are not clear to them, and I think that there is not enough space for the two letters. I agree with Fitzmyer's refutation of their reading in his commentary (1971: 111).

- "The night of my entering... Egypt" is the night after Abram entered Egypt. Hence, he was on Egyptian territory. Living in a strange country immediately has an alienating effect upon Abram. God warns him of what is going to happen there. In the Hebrew Bible, more instances can be seen, where God intervenes when an archfather is under stress after he has left his home: Isaac in Gerar (Gen. 26: 1-6), and Jacob in Bethel (Gen. 28: 10-22). Both experience God's presence and support at a moment of alienation.

- "[and loo]k". Whereas Fitzmyer has not translated it, I have rendered קָנָה with "and look", because this idiom indicates a shift in narrative perspective (Alter 1996: XXXI). Fitzmyer writes: "Here we find the characteristic use of הַנְּ in the account of visions or theophanies" (1971: 111). See also XX: 27.

- He saw two trees. Fitzmyer writes:

The elements of this dream are drawn from Ps 92. 13, 'The righteous will flourish like the palm-tree: he will grow high like a cedar in Lebanon.' Rabbinical literature often related this verse of Ps 92 to the story of Abram and Sarai (Gn 12. 17): Genesis Rabbah 41. 1; Midrash Tanhuma, Lekh 4; Zohar on Gn 12. It is not impossible that Ct 5. 15 (where the youth is compared to a cedar) and 7. 7-8 (where the girl is compared to a palm) may also have influenced this passage. (1971: 111)
Luijken Gevirtz refutes the allusions to Ps. 92, *Genesis Rabbah, Tanhumah* and the *Zohar*. She states that those pericopes mentioned palms and cedars in different situations, and "then symbolically connected" them:

with Abram and Sarai as prototypes of righteousness. But none of the above passages specifically links Abram to the cedar and Sarai to the palm- tree, a distinction which is crucial in the Genesis Apocryphon. Secondly, in the Zohar passage cited, the 'tree-cutting' motif is connected with the palm- tree which stood for the righteous in general; it is not linked with the cedar or the individual Abram in any way. Lastly, the Genesis Apocryphon does not portray Abram and Sarai as prototypes of righteousness, nor does it make any reference to Psalm 92. It seems, therefore, that any perceived parallels between the rabbinic elaborations on Psalm 92: 13 and the much earlier account of Abram's dream in the *Genesis Apocryphon*, are purely coincidental. (Luijken Gevirtz 1992: 238-9; bold is mine.)

When Luijken Gevirtz wrote this passage column XIV of the *Genesis Apocryphon* was still unknown, due to the bad state of the scroll. MQS, however, published part of column XIV in 1995. In that column Noah also seems to be compared with a cedar- tree, and his three sons with willows (MQS 1995: 48-49). According to Fröhlich:

the overall bias of the pericope on Noah in the Genesis Apocryphon is to bear witness to Noah's righteousness and his right to be promised, and to take, possession of the land. (1998: 95)

Since column XIV: 9 seems to depict Noah as a cedar, which is the symbol of righteousness in the Hebrew Bible, this could very well indicate that there is a link between him and Abram in the *Genesis Apocryphon*. Land is promised to both of them. Both of them are compared to a cedar. Thus, the conclusion must be that any parallels between Psalm 92: 13 and the account of Abram's dream in the *Genesis Apocryphon* are not purely
coincidental, as Luijken Gevirtz states. However, I do agree with her first two statements, viz. that Psalm 92, Genesis Rabbah, Tanhumah and the Zohar do not link Abram to the cedar and Sarai to the date-palm, and secondly that in the Zohar the tree-cutting motif is connected with the palm-tree and not with the cedar.

Above, I have written "much earlier" in bold to stress the fact that Fitzmyer remarks that, except for the above-mentioned rabbinical texts, the Song of Songs may also have influenced this passage. Thus, he suggests that those rabbinical texts, which were fixed after 400 C.E., had an influence upon the Genesis Apocryphon, which dates back to the late first century B.C.E., or to the first half of the first century C.E (see 1.3.4. The Date of 1QapGen: 26).

Jacobs thinks that the tree imagery might have been:

regarded as appropriate to the theme of Abraham producing offspring, particularly in an agricultural society, which made extensive use of horticultural imagery in describing sexual relationships. (1995: 139)

The fact that he does not mention the woman through whom the offspring was supposed to be produced, is a shortcoming in his argumentation, but his argument about the tree imagery is sound.

בפי

is peculiar in having a final -n on the 3 pl. masc. Peal pf., a form unknown in Biblical Aramaic... or in Reichsaramäisch... It is, however, found regularly in Jewish Palestinian Aramaic -- another indication of the transitional type of Aramaic found in this text.

---

40 The Zohar was written under the pseudepigraph of Simeon ben Jochai who lived in the first century C.E. However, the Zohar was probably written or edited by Moses of Leon (end 13th cent.) in Spain (Oppenheimer 1971: 756). It seems anachronistic to suggest that this book had an influence upon 1QapGen, as Fitzmyer does.
Both Kutscher \(1977: \text{10-11}\) and Fitzmyer \(1972: \text{29, 58 and 112}\) read this form as "although Qimron agrees with Beyer \(1984: \text{172}\) that the traces seen on the photograph do not show a waw. Moreover, Qimron argues that the width of the word does not allow for the mater lectionis. Hereby Qimron refutes Fitzmyer's remark above, that this form indicates that the Aramaic of this scroll has a character, transitional to Jewish Palestinian Aramaic, thus being of a late date \(\text{Qimron }1992: \text{14-15}\). Although the text is very unclear I am apt to agree with Qimron that there is no space for the waw.

"By itself". I agree with Fitzmyer, who also provides the literal translation "in its onesses" \(1971: \text{112}, \text{see also Jastrow }1903: \text{702a}\). Vermes' translation "leaving the palm-tree (standing) alone" is less literal \(1995: \text{294}\).

Beyer \(1984: \text{172-3}\) has an interesting reading of XIX: 15 and 16. Where Fitzmyer reads: ... \([\text{א}][\text{י}][\text{מ}][\text{ת}]\) \(\text{אמש} [\text{ת}]\) \(\text{אמש} [\text{ת}]\), Beyer interpretes the scroll in this way: ... "...eine Zeder und eine Palme (15) wuchsen zusammen aus einer Wurzel. Und Leute kamen..." JLVdW \(1976: \text{88-89}\) do not mention the palm-tree's beauty either. That is clearly an interpretation of Fitzmyer's. In his commentary Fitzmyer acknowledges that:

Her beauty is not mentioned in what is preserved of that column, and in fact one may wonder whether it really figured there at all. Here it has all the characteristics of an insertion that is not really an essential part of the story -- as it really is not, given the biblical basis of the account itself" \(1971: \text{120}\).

Fitzmyer's reading as a whole is too short for the space on the scroll, but Beyer reads a great deal more into it than can be seen. Hence, the text
remains uncertain. However, since Sarai's beauty proves to be important for the interpretation of the dream, I choose Fitzmyer's reading.

In the dream there are a date-palm and a cedar. Trees have always been scarce in Egypt, necessitating the importation of wood (Ward 1992: 401a). The tree-image might stress the fact that Abram and Sarai were strangers in Egypt, not belonging there. Of each tree, only one specimen is present; in that sense each of them is alone, but the fact that they are both trees makes them members of one family (XIX: 16). If one tree is chopped down and uprooted, the other tree will be totally alone. That is why the palm-tree intervenes for the cedar.

A palm-tree produces fruit (offspring) and is thus the symbol of Sarai to whom a child has been promised. There is no speech of chopping down the date-palm, since it is not logical to cut down a tree which produces fruits. The cedar, on the contrary, was usually grown for its wood, and thus, it is to be expected that a cedar will be cut down when it has achieved the required size, or stands in the way (Luijken Gevritz 1992: 232-233). Since Abram dreamt this on the night of his entering into the land of Egypt, and since he understood that, if the palm-tree was Sarai, and he was to be the cedar (for they were from one family, XIX: 16), he was afraid that the adventure which he had begun in this strange land would cost him his life.

- Luijken Gevritz (1992: 234-237) notes that the author of the *Genesis Apocryphon* "has appropriated ... well-known motifs for his own particular purpose" (1992: 234). She firstly argues that "the motif of a tree being cut down occurs as a metaphor for disaster, destruction and death in the Hebrew Bible" (*Ezekiel* 31: 10-18, Dan. 4: 10b-11; 13b-14a; see 1992: 234), but that the author of the *Genesis Apocryphon* purposefully changes the cutting down into a threat that a tree will be cut down, which does not
materialise. The dream thus "serves to suggest a course of action which will avert this danger" (1992: 235). Furthermore, Luijken Gevirtz states that in the Hebrew Bible (Judg. 9: 7-15; II Kings 14: 9) the genre "disputation fables" are found, which can also be found in the ancient Near Eastern Wisdom literature. In those disputation fables two competing animals or plants feature. One of them is clearly at a disadvantage, but nonetheless "attempts to disparage his or her rival and win the debate" (1992: 235). In the Genesis Apocryphon, however, the two trees are not rivals trying to master each other, but they "are from one family" (XIX: 16), thus helping one another. The weak tree is helped by the stronger one.

Thus, in this second example, the author appropriates two motifs for his own purpose: a) the disputation fable loses its contesting character, and b) it is not the "anguished cedar" (1992: 237), which "confront(s) its enemies directly" (ibid.), but the fellow tree. This happens in contradiction to the story of Aḥiqar, which Luijken Gevirtz quotes in connection with her argument. Thus, the author of the Genesis Apocryphon can be considered creative, playing with several motifs at a time. Luijken Gevirtz makes clear that the author, however, has to follow the main story-line as provided in the biblical book of Genesis, since the literary genre, which he employs is "rewritten Bible". The only freedom he has in writing this story is the alteration of classical motifs, the addition of the dream in order to exonerate Abram from guilt, and the insertion of Abram's wisdom (1992: 239-243).

That the danger of chopping down the cedar is really great can be deduced from the fact that the word ḫṣv occurs three times in XIX: 15-17.

If Fitzmyer (1971: 58-59) has correctly restored the text of XIX: 15, the palm-tree is described as very beautiful. I regard Fitzmyer's interpretation
as quite interesting, since it is exactly Sarai's beauty, which is praised in the *Genesis Apocryphon*, and which in the end causes trouble. Since this work belongs to the genre "rewritten Bible", one may also expect that the beauty, which brings Sarai into trouble in the biblical text, will also be the cause of trouble in the rewritten text. This makes it likely that beauty also plays a role in the dream, which is added to the story in order to take away the blame from the honoured ancestor. However, there seems to be a problem: the comparison of beautiful Sarai and Abram with the trees seems faulty. The beauty of the one tree is usually not the reason for cutting down another tree, but in dreams unnatural things may happen. In the interpretation of the dream it plays a great role, since it provides the reason for Abram's death, namely Sarai's beauty might induce a man in this foreign country (the כָּעַס of Psalm 114: 1) to kill her husband in order to have her for himself. If Fitzmyer's restoration is correct, Abram seems to be a good interpreter of dreams. Even this small detail does not escape him. The beauty of the date-palm is mentioned in anticipation of what happens after the Egyptians have seen Sarai. That Abram is presented as a good interpreter comes as no surprise. Gnuse writes that dreams in the ancient Near East were:

no less real for many people than the impressions received during the waking hours. Dreams were viewed ... as phenomena with a special reality of their own

which:

brought the dreamer into contact with ... the realm of the gods or the dead, and dreams were an attempt by someone or something to communicate to the dreamer, who then became the intermediary between two worlds." (Gnuse 1996: 34-35)

Furthermore, Gnuse writes:
Like their contemporaries in the ancient Near East Israelites used the dream report in stereotypical fashion to respectfully describe a divine theophany. (1996: 68)

However, "the later biblical tradition sometimes assumed that dreams were an everyday human phenomenon lacking any hint of a divine message", but it was also possible that dreams were considered a test of the human spirit (Gnuse 1996: 69). In XIX: 14-17 Abram is the intermediary between two worlds: the one of the dream, and the real world. This is indicated by his ability to interpret the dream to people of the real world.

Fitzmyer also suggests a comparison of the text with the Song of Songs (1971: 119-120).

"From one family" is usually explained in two ways: husband and wife, brother and sister. However, Mace gives the deeper sense of the concept "one family" in the patriarchal society, which includes more people than those mentioned above. In the patriarchal society people who belong to the same family are not necessarily kinsmen, since people who are not related in the flesh can also make part of the unity.

Thus when a man marries, his wife enters fully into the family of her husband; she becomes 'one flesh' with him. Others, also, may be initiated into the family group. Even if they were in the first case gerim, or protégés... (1953: 68)

Therefore, if Abram and Sarai merely indicated that they were one family, further questions would be asked as to the character of their relationship. Stating the real character of their relationship would endanger Abram's life so that the lie that they were brother and sister, which was the result of Abram's pesher, was the best way to solve the emerging problem.
Beyer continues his interpretation at the second part of XIX: 16, where he writes: "...denn wir beide sind aus Einer Wurzel gewachsen!" Fitzmyer reads there: "...for we are both from one family..." In both lines Beyer is uncertain about the correct reading, since he adds a lot of circles above the uncertain letters, and brackets around parts of the words he suggests (see his *Zeichen und Abkürzungen* in Beyer 1984: 17). His second shin might be discernable, but the rest does not fit the traces. That is why I hold on to Fitzmyer's version.

- **AY** had the following reading (1956: 40-41):

  \[ אָרָי הַדְּרַמָא מְנִי פֶּה \]

  "for cursed is he who will fell..." Dupont-Sommer (1961: 286) follows them in his translation. Fitzmyer refutes this reading in his commentary (1971: 112-113), and follows Ginsberg by inserting \( שׁ \) instead of \( שׁ \). I also read a nun on the CD-Rom.

- **JLVdW** (1976: 90-91) read: \[ אָרָי הַדְּרַמָא מְנִי פֶּה \], "for both of us are from...", which is, in fact, what is discernable on the scroll. However, I follow Fitzmyer's conjecture because it makes sense, and since there is enough space on the scroll for his insertion.

- My translation "shouted" is based upon Jastrow's translation of מִלְחָא, חַלֶּה (1903: 642a). Muraoka (1972: 48) refutes Fitzmyer's translation "remonstrated" (Fitzmyer 1971: 112), and also suggests a translation with "to shout".

- I translate \( נָתַן \) with "leave...(alone)" in order to make it as concordant as possible. See also XIX: 15 and 19.

- Fitzmyer, whose translation I prefer, translates מִלְחָא thus: "with the help of...", and concludes that this is a Babylonianism, etymologically related to Hebrew מָר, "shadow, shade," a figure for protection... The sense, then, is
that the cedar was spared with the help of the date-palm." (1971: 113). See also Muraoka 1972: 40. JLVdW (1076: 91) have: "by the protection of". Beyer (1984: 590) translates יִבְאֶל with "dank, wegen", and so does Garcia Martínez (1994: 232, "thanks to").

"And [it was] not [cut down]." Beyer (1984: 172) reads יִבְאֶל, the Part. pass. m. sg. of יִבְאֶל, whereas Fitzmyer reads the Ithpe.: יִבְאֶל. The meaning is the same, but Beyer's reading runs beautifully parallel with יִבְאֶל in XIX: 16. However, Qimron seems to read יִבְאֶל, a form in which "there is one alef instead of two consecutive ones". He adds that the "spelling -ו instead of א is known from other Aramaic and Hebrew sources" (1992: 15). On the other hand, Muraoka (1993: 43-44) argues, that the correct idiom would be either יִבְאֶל or יִבְאֶל. But there is no space for such a long word. I read יִבְאֶל on CD-Rom (with space between the brackets for only one letter), and thus I agree with Beyer.

At the end of the line Abram begins speaking to Sarai by means of a verbal sentence, in which the object comes first. Whereas, in biblical Hebrew the word order is of great importance, in Aramaic, and consequently in this text, it is not. An object may both follow and precede the verb without any implications as to emphasis etc. (BL 1962: 339 §100p).

Just like the author calls himself "Abram" in XIX: 14, he refers to Sarah as "Sarai", her name before Gen. 17: 15. This is the first time that this archmother in spe is mentioned in the pericope. The reason might be that the text is damaged. In XIX: 17, 21-22 Sarai's name occurs thrice, and once she is referred to as רְאוֹאָה in XIX: 17. She stands at the centre of interest.
JLVdW add נא after the first word of this line, \( \text{הנ}: \). Beyer (1984: 172-3), however, reads \( \text{v}: \text{v} \), "Von jetzt an..."; I could not discern which suggestion was the best. However, both interpretations do not bring great changes in the understanding of the text.

..., [and I] am frightened by this dream." Nickelsburg concludes that the Apocryphon's stories show interest "in the character's emotions and in their expressions of these emotions", and gives more examples (1998: 148). This is certainly true, especially in comparison with the biblical Genesis, but the author of the Genesis Apocryphon never overwhelms the audience with overly emotional language. They are always functional and serve to keep the audience in suspense.

"That I may know" is a volitive use of the imperfectum (Fitzmyer 1971: 113).

In dreams of the ancient Near East, visual symbolic dreams were often very difficult to understand, with the result that a second dream was required to decode it, or advice from someone else, "frequently women" (Gnuse 1996: 45). In contrast to this convention, Abram does not ask Sarai's advice, but is capable of interpreting the dream himself. In XIX: 18-19 the author skips Abram's dream report, thus emphasising the fact that Abram, the man of God, could interpret it himself. This presentation of the dream does not reveal anything of the way in which Abram told it to Sarai, neither does the author give a glimpse of how this pesher came to Abram's mind. If Fitzmyer's restoration of the text (1971: 60) is correct, no special effort goes into attributing the power of interpretation to God, as Gnuse does observe in biblical dream reports such as Gen. 41: 16, 25, 28, 39 (Joseph).

\[\text{\footnotesize 41 However, see my explanation of XIX: 20 below.}\]
and Dan. 2: 17-23, 27-28, 45, 47 (Gnuse 1996: 71). The interpretation is really Abram’s. Consequently, it is also his responsibility.

19 The beginning of line 19 is difficult to read. AY only read the word "dream" and the letter א. Beyer is very uncertain about the contents of this line. However, Fitzmyer (1971: 60) seems certain about a few more letters than they are, and is thus able to give a clearer reading. It remains a hypothesis, but it fits well in the context.

- "Who will seek to kill me and leave you (alone)". Fitzmyer translates thus: "who will seek to kill me and to spare you". For the translation of נַשְׁבָּה: see XIX: 15 and 16. Fitzmyer remarks that לֹא לֶאָכָל נַשְׁבָּה: “is the literal translation of the Hebr. of Gn 12. 12, with the verbs transferred to infinitival forms, against the whole Targumic tradition” (1971: 114). The Hebrew text is as follows: כֹּל וַיִּזַּח עַל עַל נַשְׁבָּה. Indeed the anti-thetical chiasmus is kept intact, but the literal translation is not as literal a translation of נַשְׁבָּה as expected after this enthusiastic remark by Fitzmyer.

- מַעֲקַשְׁבֵּב מְרָא שֶׁל מְשִׁית: Muraoka remarks that the use of the lamed in לֶאָכָל לֶאָכָל "is the only possible way to reproduce the force of contrast intended in the Heb." (1972: 31). Unfortunately this emphatic word order cannot be reflected in English.

- לֶאָכָל [Jastrow 1903: 1516b: "1) to leave, let go; to forsake, abandon; to leave behind; to bequeath"] appears in a pun in XIX: 19, whereas נַשְׁבָּה [Jastrow 1903: 1179a: "2) to escape"] is used in XIX: 20.

- Further on in line 19 there is a lacuna in Fitzmyer’s reading: [אָכָל לֶאָכָל], where he translates: "Now(?) this is all the favour". Fitzmyer successfully refutes the scholars who translate "this day all the good...", on the grounds of the gender of the word אָכָל. Moreover, this
passage is similar to Gen. 20: 13 (1971: 114). Beyer (1984: 172-3) has the following reading: "in Ägypten (allein) am Leben zu lassen." This reading is surprising, since several scholars, amongst whom Puech who was quoted by Beyer, have stated that the reading of JLVdW יר[ב], 'but', is certain (Qimron 1992: 15-16). On CD-Rom no trace of כ can be found. What is left, indeed seems to indicate כ. Hence, I have translated "but".

Fitzmyer's reading is as follows: "Wherever we shall be, say about me, "He is my brother." כ [נַבָּה דָּוִד אֲמָרָה] עלֵי דָּוִד אֲמָרָה, whereas Beyer's reading is: כ [נַבָּה דָּוִד אֲמָרָה], "An jedem Ort, and, den wir kommen, sage von mir..." (1984: 172-3). In his commentary, Fitzmyer remarks that a lamed is usually preserved by the upper shaft. Since that is also my experience, and since I do not see a remnant of the upper shaft on the CD-Rom, I agree with Fitzmyer's reading. The following argument is also in favour of his version: it is an almost literal translation of Gen. 20: 13, כ [נַבָּה דָּוִד אֲמָרָה] עלֵי דָּוִד אֲמָרָה.

The reversed word-order, formulating that they are brother and sister, can be found both in the Hebrew and in the Aramaic texts. According to Bauer and Leander (BL 1962: 327, §98a) the normal word-order in a nominal (Aramaic) sentence is subject-predicate. The reversed word-order may occur when the predicate is emphasised, or for other reasons, e.g. in order to connect the sentence with the previous one. The latter is the case in this line, and in XX: 10 and 27. Hence, the emphasis found in the Genesis text, cannot be found here. Emphasis is expressed by the voice, and is not expressed by written texts (BL 1962: 327, §98a). However, in the

---

42 BL 1962: 327, §98a: "Das gewöhnliche Mittel, irgend einen Satzteil besonders
translation I have tried to emphasise the word "brother" like a person who
knows the original text would probably do while reading it aloud. (The
same counts for "sister" in XX: 27.)

- It is interesting, that the author plays with words in this line and elsewhere
(XIX: 19 and XX: 10). This is in contrast to what Vernes writes in his
Scripture and Tradition in Judaism (1961: 126). The pun is to be found in
the repeated occurrence of יש ידיהו הנשים בשלום. This reveals how he
(or Abram, perhaps according to the author?) associated the one יש with
the other.

- AY, Fitzmyer and I read first ידיהו הנשים בשלום and later יש ידיהו הנשים
This gives a beautiful parallel, but "with your help" is certainly the correct
reading. The י is clearly visible
on CD- Rom. Fitzmyer's reading indicates Abram's dependence on Sarai
in this situation in contrast to Beyer's version.

- The verb יתבג means "to escape, be spared" (Jastrow 1903: 1178b- 1179a,
second meaning). See in comparison "to leave; let go; to forsake,
abandon; to leave behind; to bequeath" (Jastrow 1903: 1516b) in the
analysis of XIX: 19 in this Chapter.

- Fitzmyer translates "my life will be saved..." I have rendered יש concordantly. See also column XIX: 23.

22 Zaan is Tanis in the LXX, a city, founded as Avaris about 1730 B.C.E. It
was Egypt's capital during the rule of the Hyksos (from approximately
1720- 1550 B.C.E.), according to Fitzmyer (1971: 117) and Beyer (1984:
172). Fitzmyer holds that the introduction of Zoan "into the story here is most likely tied up with the traditional relative dating of Tanis and Hebron, as in Jubilees 13. 12" (1971: 116), which in its turn is dependent on Numbers 13: 22. Fitzmyer translates "toward Zoan" which I have followed, since this indicates that they go into the direction of Zoan, which is Pharaoh's residence according to line 24. They, however, do not intend to pay him a visit. They probably merely go in that direction since Zoan lies in a fertile, well-watered territory; "on the second eastern branch of the Nile Delta (see Nm. 13. 22; Is 19. 11, 13; 30. 4; Ez 30. 14; Ps 78. 12, 43)"; thus Fitzmyer (1971: 116).

Fitzmyer mentions a problem concerning the dating of the building of Hebron and Zoan (1971: 116-7). According to Jubilees 13: 12 Abram dwelt in Hebron for two years" Thereupon, he moved to Egypt where he lived "for five years before Sarai was torn away from him" (1971: 117). This makes the moment when Sarai was taken away from him seven years after their arrival at Hebron, which was being built at the time of their arrival. Zoan was built seven years after Hebron (Jub. 13: 12; Num. 13: 22). Hence, Sarai was taken away from Abram when Zoan was being built. In 1QapGen XIX: 22 (Sarai's fear after Abram's dream) Zoan is mentioned as a place that exists. Hence, that allusion must be anachronistic: Zoan was only being built at the time of Sarai's abduction. In XIX: 24 (the visit by the princes which resulted in Sarai's abduction) there is also the speech of (Pharaoh) Zoan. It is likely that Zoan was a city everybody was talking about at the time when it was being built, for the building of Zoan was the basis of the Egyptian era system (GVI 1961: 703). Hence, this title in XIX: 24 is no anachronism, but appropriate.

---

43 Henceforth Jubilees is abbreviated as Jub.
The attempt to fill in lacunae of time and place is one of the characteristics of aggadic midrashim (Mack 1989: 127), which can also be found here (see Appendix D).

Bernstein writes that the mention of Zoon and Hebron is anticipatory to prevent the readers of later passages from asking questions as to the origin of it (1996: 55-56). Indeed, Hebron also features in 1QapGen XXI: 19-20 and XXII: 3, but Zoon does not feature in what is left of 1QapGen.

23 (XIX: 23) Abram fears due to what he sees in a dream (XIX: 17-18), Sarai is afraid "lest any [one] should see her [ ]." In both situations fear is the result of an obtained insight; Sarai, however, fears that others might see her in their turn, for seeing her might lead to her exposure to foreign men. Hence, the word "see" is loaded with meaning in the third and the fourth paragraph. For other words indicating that Abram "saw" in a dream, see my analysis of XIX: 14.

JLVdW (1976: 92-93) have a very different version, which already starts at the end of line 22:

Its translation is as follows: "Sarai refrained from going to Zoon (23) with me; and she was very much on her guard that nobody would see her, five years long." Beyer (1984: 172-3) has yet another reading of the end of line 22, and line 23:

"..., doch sträubte sich] Sarai sehr, sich nach Soan zu wenden, (23) [denn sie fürchtete sich] heftig in ihrer Seele, daß sie jemand vom Pharao von
Soan sähe". Beyer is not sure of the four words after הילס. This is his conjecture. I can read the word המה on CD-ROM, but further there is no evidence in favour of either Jongeling's or Beyer's version. Therefore, I hold with the version of my starting point; Fitzmyer's, who also reads the word המה.

23* "And after those five years". Qimron (1992: 16; 1999: 106) remarks that the scroll does not read לולש אלא but המה (تحمل אל). See also XX: 18. This shows that all the editors have followed the edition of AY, without reading the original or the photographs independently. The meaning, however, is not different.

"And after those five years". According to JLvdW Sarai hid herself for five years (1976: 92-93). Knibb also holds "that Sarai attempted to conceal herself" (1994: 190-191). From Fitzmyer's version it is clear that she succeeded in hiding herself for five years. How she did this is not related. It is possible that the author wants the audience to think that God wanted them to survive the famine, and that He took care that they lived peacefully in Egypt during the period of the famine.

Life must have been very dull and lonesome for Sarai during those five years, since she saw nobody except her relatives. However, that situation changed quickly and radically. Column XLIX: 24 tells us that some of the princes of Egypt came concerning her. This refers to the situation as described in XLIX: 14.

24 Fitzmyer (1971: 60) gives his own interpretation of the first word of this line: ["םֹאָ], which fits well in the context. Beyer leaves it open in his Aramaic text, but adds "[besuchten mich, Abram,]" in his translation (1984: 174). Moreover, Beyer interprets the second illegible space in the text as
follows: (?) This is conjecture, not supported by any readable letters on the scroll. Beyer acknowledges that, for in addition to the question mark, he puts circles above the letters of those three words in his edition. I follow Fitzmyer's edition. In Beyer's interpretation there is no speech of Sarai hiding herself: "Und nach diesen fünf Jahren (24) [besuchten mich, Abram,] drei Männer von den Großen Ägyptens, vom Hofstaat des Pharao von Soan..." (1984: 173-4). Dupont-Sommer's version is similar to Beyer's (1961: 286).

- Muraoka correctly remarks that Fitzmyer's restoration of "𐤆𐤄𐤃𐤋" is erroneous, "since it is the masc. pl. det. noun that requires the fem. cst. form of the numeral" (1972: 22). Consequently, he reads אֹבלֶל in 3. See also Rosenthal 1983: 32.

- I prefer the translation "princes" to Fitzmyer's "nobles". This is in agreement with Jastrow 1903: 1446b.

- is a 3 pl. m. of רָאָת (Fitzmyer 1971: 118).

- They came "concerning [my] words". Column XIX: 15 explains what is meant by this: his wisdom, and truth. Vermees (1995: 294) does not translate "words", but "business", and so does Dupont-Sommer in the English version of his book (1961: 286). However, he adds a question mark. That might be due to the fact that Dupont-Sommer reads "[?" (see Fitzmyer 1971: 117). Vermees probably reads מָלֶא, which means "store, goods, merchandise" (Jastrow 1903: 785b: I). This suggests that Abram was a tradesman. Vermees' reading misses a lot of material, which Fitzmyer supplies, especially in line 25. The translation "words" is more in agreement with the context in the versions of Fitzmyer and JLVdW, where there are allusions to Abram's wisdom and truth, the Book of the Words of
Enoch and again "words" in line 26. It is a context of eloquence, rather than business.

They came "concerning ... my wife". It is possible that they wanted to get acquainted with the family behind this wise foreigner, but since the word "wife" is explicitly stated, they must have known, or guessed, something about her. Be this as it may, Sarai's loneliness was over.

Fitzmyer's reading was as follows: ["me many gifts and asked of me]..." In the version of JLVdW (1976: 92- 93) a different word is used for "to ask", and the open space which Fitzmyer leaves uninterpreted, is filled with the word "make known":... "me many gifts and asked me to make known good and true wisdom." Beyer (1984: 173) agrees with Fitzmyer's ["me, but reads מגדות instead of Fitzmyer's מגדות; "und sie fragten mich nach der Erkenntnis, der Weisheit..." The passage is unreadable on CD- Rom. However, the fact that there are two witnesses who read a form of מגדות in this space is interesting. It is strange, that Beyer does not have the word מגדות, since it occurs in the versions of AY, Fitzmyer, and JLVdW.

My translation "numerous" is derived from Jastrow (1903: 954a).

Speculation is rife about why the princes gave numerous gifts. There are several possibilities:

a) in exchange for wisdom,

b) in order to dispose Abram's mind to friendliness (they came for Sarai),

c) it was a Middle- eastern custom to bring gifts when paying a visit.

Fitzmyer (1971: 118) compares this with 2 Chr. 1: 10- 12, where Solomon asks God wisdom and knowledge to rule His people. The author,
considering himself Abram's co-religionist⁴¹, could indeed regard Abram
as a mediator between God and the Egyptian *ignorami*.

Fitzmyer wonders if one can see a reflection of the Solomon and Queen of
Sheba motif in this passage, the arrival with gifts and the seeking of
wisdom (cf. 1 Kings 4: 29-30; 10: 1-13). The author wanted to indicate
that Abram possessed a great deal of wisdom. In that context Garcia
Martinez' translation (1994: 232) is interesting: "They gave me [many
presents *expecting* from me] goodness, wisdom and truth" (italics are
mine). However, see 3.7. **Analysis of the Narrative**: 189.

following reading: ידועי, תמצית, שָׁבָט יַעֲקֹבְ בֶּן יְהוָה, which, indeed, fits the traces in the scroll
better than לַל חֹבֶּר [חרב] of Fitzmyer and JLVdW.

"The [book] of the Words of [En]och". This passage suggests that Abram
possessed the book of *Enoch*. *Enoch* was very popular in Qumranic
literature, but Knibb warns that:

> it would be misleading to try to tie any of these passages to the actual
books of Enoch that we possess. According to Pseudo-Eupolemus...
Abraham taught the Egyptians 'astrology and other such things', the
discovery of which he traced back to Enoch. (1994: 191-2)

Consequently, this reference cannot be considered a witness of the early
existence of the book. It is clear, however, that the author wants to make
clear, that Abram was better educated than the Egyptians. Fitzmyer
reminds that one of the princes at least eventually acknowledges Abram's
superiority (XX: 21), and that there are also stories about Abram teaching
his and Enoch's wisdom to the Egyptians (1971: 118).

- No mention is made of Abram's wife, whereas the princes came in

⁴¹ See 4.2. **Hellenistic Influences on 1QapGen**: 241.
connection with her (XIX: 24). This can be due to the lacuna in the text, but it seems more probable that the author wants to keep the audience in suspense, and that an emphasis on Abram's careless attitude when confronted with the Egyptians' friendliness is being created.

26 The word "famine" in XIX: 26 stands in a great contrast to "much eating and [much] drinking" in XIX: 27. Abram probably tells the Egyptians why he left Canaan for Egypt. As they get to know each other better, the situation seems to get more and more relaxed, and the impression is created that they are having a nice party, as the passage "much eating and [much] drinking" suggests.

The question mark is from Fitzmyer, who finds the word צָמַי problematic. He refers to one instance where the noun צָמַי is found in Aramaic, meaning "place" (1971: 119). צָמַי can also be read as an Inf. constr. pe' al of צָמַי as Beyer, García Martínez (1994: 232, "urging until") and Dupont- Sommer (1961: 286, "to insist (?) until") do.

Beyer (1984: 173-174) has a different reading of the sentence: צָמַי הוהי [בְּשָׁם] וְלַמֵּסַי מַעַלָּה נָא לֵּב [תְּשֶׁרֶף] 26; "Und sie wollten nicht aufstehen, bis ich sie ihnen gezeigt hatte zur [Bestätigung] meiner Worte". I have underlined the letters where Fitzmyer and Beyer agree. Beyer is sure of the two loose standing lameds, and of one yod instead of Fitzmyer's waw, and of one waw where Fitzmyer has a yod. That is not a strong argument in favour of his version. From what I can discern, I have to agree with Fitzmyer's reading of צָמַי, where Beyer reads צָמַי. Certainly no ב can be read there, whereas the trace of an א can be discerned. What Beyer interprets in the second line in the above is merely conjecture.
Nonetheless, Beyer's version is interesting, for it links the beginning of the story with the praise of Sarai's beauty.

- Fitzmyer reads "to her" in XIX: 26. This might be an allusion to Sarai, but this is not certain at all.

27 Beyer has the same reading of this line except for some loose standing lameds, which Fitzmyer reads, but Beyer does not. The differences have no impact on the understanding of the text.

- Fitzmyer (1971: 119) suggests a comparison of XIX: 27 with XXII: 15 (where king Melchizedek brings out food and drink for Abram and for all the men who were with him, after they had overcome the kings); 1 Kings 10: 4 (the queen of Sheba observing all Solomon's wisdom etc.) and Dt. 5: 10, where it is said: "... but showing steadfast love to the thousandth generation of those who love me and keep my commandments." It might be correct that God gives abundantly to people who walk with Him, but a reward for walking with God is not the issue in this very passage. Neither is the issue the celebration of a victory. Nor is Abram's wisdom the issue, as I will show in the analysis.
It is unknown when the direct speech started.

- Beyer (1984: 173) reads יָרֵא instead of Fitzmyer's יָרֵא before יָרֵא. JLVdW also read the יָרֵא (1976: 92), but the rest is not found in their work. I cannot discern on CD-Rom what is written there.

- Vermes suggests that the Egyptians must have seen Sarai during the party, which was described at the end of the previous column (1995: 294).

JLVdW (1976: 92-93) have read in the beginning of this line: יֵשׁנִיָּהוּ תָּמַם, translated by: "lovely and how fine". Beyer (1984: 173-4) reads the beginning of this line very different: "ganz schwarz und (schön) geschnitten". I cannot discern which reading is the best.

- Whether a waw or a yod occur in it is not discernable to me. Fitzmyer reads יִשְֹא in agreement with Kutscher's difficult construction of two ethical datives after each other (Fitzmyer 1971: 121; Rosenthal 1983: 20). This is the only correct option, for a Pe' al impf. f. pl. with initial ב of יֵשְׁנִיָּהוּ would have both a yod and a waw.

- Fitzmyer translates: "How pleasant is her nose", since the word for "nose" is the singular of that for face (Fitzmyer 1971: 121). See also JLVdW 1976: 93. I have translated "desirable" in accordance with Jastrow (1903: 1447a).

Beyer (1984: 173-4) reads יִשְׁנִיָּהוּ, "wie zart", where Fitzmyer leaves a lacuna. Beyer is certain of none of the letters he inserts. This passage is unreadable to me.

- "whiteness". Similar descriptions of physical health and beauty can be found in the Song of Songs and Lamentations. There physical health and
beauty are described as white and ruddy (Song of Songs 5: 10 and Lamentations 4: 7; see Pope, 1977: 307).

5 JLVDW (1976: 94-95) read the beginning of this line thus: 'perfect they are! and how... is". Fitzmyer (1971: 62) reads 'perfect! And (how) [attractive". Beyer (1984: 173-4) reads "schmal... Wie lauter ist". Since AY have the same reading as Fitzmyer, except for what the latter writes between brackets, Fitzmyer's is the most conservative reading. The fact that both JLVDW and Beyer read reader's... where AY have a lacuna is interesting. However, I discern a and a at the place where Fitzmyer reads . Hence, I agree with Fitzmyer.

6 I have translated "go up to" in accordance with Jastrow 1903: 584b.

7 .. Here I follow Fitzmyer's interpretation "whatever ... is to her hands" (1971: 124).
- Fitzmyer's "numbering of the lines corresponds to that of AY, even though it is one line off (see pl. 20). Line 7 should really be line 6" (1971: 105).

8 VanderKam considers 1QapGen XX: 2-8a a poem. He has detected poetic devices such as parallelism, meter, chiasm, paronomasia, repetition of similar sounds, and inclusion (1979: 57-94).
- Knibb writes that Sarai's praise before the king is "to some extent reminiscent of the description of the bride in the Song of Songs (e.g. 4: 1-7; 6: 4-10; 7: 1-9)" (1994: 192).
Cohen also draws that parallel, and shows that both the *Song of Songs* and Sarai's song of praise belong to the Near Eastern love poetry, the former being a classical example, whereas the latter is a Hellenised example. One of the characteristics of Near Eastern love poetry is that it contains descriptions of bodily beauty in contrast to:

the love poetry of Greece and Rome, which rarely has detailed descriptions of bodily beauty but which frequently has appreciation for feminine wisdom/skill. (1981: 50)

Cohen suggests that the author of the *Genesis Apocryphon* has Hellenised the Near Eastern descriptive song by describing both Sarai's beauty and her wisdom (XX: 7). He is not the only Palestinian who mixed these two forms of poetry. Philodemus, who was born c. 110 B.C.E. in Gadara (Syria), did the same in his description of *The Beauty of Flora* (Cohen 1981: 48). The praise of Sarai in 1QapGen might seem different from the one by Philodemus, since he refers to Flora's *skills*, whereas Horqonwash praises Sarai's *wisdom*. But Cohen rightly remarks that חכמה and σοφία mean both wisdom and skill (1981: 46, and 52, note 19).

Cohen wonders why similes do not occur in 1QapGen, as they were standard in the Near Eastern tradition, and since similes in which a woman was compared to fruits and flowers "were standard Greek epithalamia and love poems" (*sic!* 1981: 53, note 27). Consequently, this song of praise has the character of "Greek-style rhetoric" (Cohen 1981: 49), which "replaces the exotic images of the classic" Near Eastern descriptive poem (thus Cohen 1981: 49). The only variation, which Horqonwash employs is חכמה, or חה at the beginning of each exclamation of praise (1981: 53, note 27). Herrmann compares 1QapGen to the novel *Joseph and Aseneth*, which he considers far more lively (Herrmann 1991: 342). However, the
"detailed inventory of the body, from the head down or from the feet up, is
classical" according to Cohen (1981: 44), which indicates that this passage
in 1QapGen partly represents the classical Near Eastern tradition.

Muraoka also sees allusions to *Proverbs* 31 in this passage of the *Genesis
Apocryphon* "as did the midrash Tanhuma in the section 'Life of Sarah'."
(1993: 45).

In his commentary (1971: 124-127) Fitzmyer has a long discussion as to
where the name Hirqanos comes from, and how it should be spelled. The
then current Greek name by which Hyrcanus II, who had been in Egypt,
was addressed, and the Egyptian name "Horus is true" with the Greek
ending -oç seem to him the best candidates, but Fitzmyer doubts whether
they are the origins of the name. Grelot supplies a thorough and interesting
investigation into the origin of the name HR-QN-WŠ in the *Revue de
Qumran* 28 (1971: 557-567). There he firstly denounces the solutions
provided by the diverse scholars, and then promotes his own hypothesis.
According to his hypothesis the name consists of three elements, i.e. HR-
QN-WŠ, each of which consists of two letters." HR then, refers to Horus",
QN means "strong", consequently, the first part of the name would mean
"Horus is strong". The third element, WŠ means "powerful" (puissant) or
"honoured" (honoré). A combination of the three elements, of which Grelot
proves that it may occur in casu Egyptian names, would then mean "Horus
the strong is honoured (or powerful)", in Grelot's own words, "Horus le fcr

45 This is Grelot's spelling (1971: 563).
46 Henceforth RQ.
47 In my transcription I use sh for the letter shin in agreement with the system in
"Systems of Transliteration and of Citation of Proper Names" as described in the
*Jewish Encyclopedia*, I, (1916: no page- number).
48 The H of Horus used to be transcribed by means of π (H) in the Aramaic papyri of
est honoré (ou puissant)” (1971: 564). The vocalisation of the name would probably be Horqonwās (Horqonwash in my translation), or Harqonwās (Grelot 1971: 564). Grelot wonders how the name became known in an environment "si peu familiarisé avec les institutions égyptiennes qu'il place à Tanis (=So‘an) la résidence du Pharaon au temps d'Abraham" (1971: 565). However, see 4.2. Hellenistic Influences on 1QapGen: 243.


- The meaning of הִפַּל (pa‘el) is in general "to speak", corresponding to the biblical Hebrew הָפֵךְ, הָפֵךְ (See Jastrow 1903: 792b).

- "He loved her much". Fitzmyer refers to the nuance of desire, which he expresses in his translation "he coveted her very much" (1971: 127). His translation is very attractive. However, I prefer to remain faithful to the meaning as supplied by Jastrow (1903: 1467a) for הָפֵשָׁה, which is: "to love".

9 שִׁית is an Af el perf. 3 m. sg. See also Kutscher, 1965: 31, XX, 7(!).

- נָהָי. This probably means that Pharaoh took Sarai into his house, which was one of the requirements of marriage in ancient Egypt (Pestman 1961: 25- 30).

- "Sought to kill me" shows that Abram was in danger of losing his life. Pharaoh probably thought that Abram was Sarai's husband. This text also suggests that Sarai was cornered when the Egyptians sought to kill her husband, and that only then, when Abram's life was in danger, she did what Abram had asked from her in XIX: 20. She told this lie only when his life was at stake. Then she chose life. This reminds of Dt. 30: 19- 20, where
people, who choose life, and love God, obeying Him and holding fast to 
Him, are promised life and length of days "so that you may live in the land 
that the Lord swore to give to your ancestors, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to 
Jacob." If the author had this text in mind he made of Sarai a great 
example, worthy of imitation; she chose life, and she loved God, obeying 
what He had revealed to her husband in a dream, and holding fast to Him. 
She was rewarded; she grew old (Gen. 23: 1), she returned to the Promised 
Land (XX: 30- XXI: 4), and her descendants lived there too (Josh. 24: 16-
18).

This argumentation confirms Fitzmyer's reading of XIX: 22 "so that] Sarai 
[no longer wished] to go toward Zoan" (1971: 60- 61): Sarai wanted to 
avoid trouble and lies.

The י in נָעַר introduces direct speech as Kutscher correctly remarks 
(1965: 31). The suffix, indeed, suggests direct speech. However, the 
conflation of י with יָנָה indicates, that the author does not intend to let 
Sarai speak for herself, but that he just indicates what she has said49. This 
conflation is very meaningful, since it suggests the haste with which Sarai 
said it to Pharaoh. She did not even finish the word יָנָה properly! This 
reminds the reader of the fact that in the description of the dream in XIX: 
16 is written, "Now the date- palm shouted and said...". The shouting in 
this line could refer to a sudden reaction of the date- palm when she hears 
the plan to cut down and uproot the cedar. Thus, the dream predicts Sarai's 
sudden reaction when confronted with Pharaoh's plan to kill Abram.

49 In the above- mentioned remark Kutscher reads נָעַר instead of נָעַר, which is 
evidently a printing error.
"He's my brother", see also XIX: 20. Here we see that what is Abram's instruction in XIX: 20, i.e. "Where[rev]er [we shall be, say] about me, He's my brother", needed not be stated so generally. In reality, Sarai has to say it to Pharaoh only.

- I have translated "while I was negotiating about what concerned her" (i.e. about her release) in accordance with Muraoka, who argues:

  1) The phrase 'L DYLH' hardly means "by her, for her sake", for which our Scroll might use BTL(L)H; cf. XIX, 16, 20. - 2) Due attention should be paid to the tense of the periphrastic construction used here, HWYT MTGR. (1972: 42)

Muraoka argues that the rule of consecutio temporum to be observed in Modern European languages (see 'might' in ... Fitzmyer's translation) is entirely foreign to Aramaic ... It is not surprising by any means that the patriarch should be conducting such a bargain in pecuniary terms. (1972: 42-43)

is then the verb in question according to Muraoka (see also Jastrow 1646b, ithpa/pe). Herewith Fitzmyer's argumentation (1971: 127-8) is well refuted.

- "while I was negotiating about what concerned her"

This suggests, that Abram confirmed Sarai's claim that he was her brother, and that he consequently, acted as someone who could give her in marriage. This interpretation is in accordance with Van Dijk- Hemmes' translation "for the price of you" (2.2.3. Notes: 53).

- "and I, Abram, was left alone on account of hers, and was not killed."

Note, that in Abram's interpretation of the dream it is the palm- tree (Sarai), whom the men want to leave alone, and the cedar (Abram) who is cut (killed). Hence, the wife- sister motif has a real impact on the
unravelling of the plot.

- "I, Abram" occurs once in verse 10 and once in verse 11. It emphasises the suggestion that this narrative is told by the lofty ancestor Abram.

- Fitzmyer (1971: 128) correctly writes, that אֱלֹהִי הָאָדָם means "on account of hers", although he translates "because of her". See also Beyer's grammar (1984: 424). Whether that really refers to her beauty, as Fitzmyer suggests, is to be doubted. He probably concluded this since he wondered if there is a reference to the last word in line אֱלֹהִי הָאָדָם. However, I think it refers to her lie, since it was the lie that saved Abram's life, and it was the lie which left her all by herself in Pharaoh's harem. The forms אֱלֹהִי הָאָדָם, אֱלֹהִי הָאָדָם, אֱלֹהִי הָאָדָם, and אֱלֹהִי הָאָדָם sound similar. Therefore, they can be considered a pun, emphasising that the whole story is about Sarai. This is in agreement with what I concluded about the gifts of the princes in 3.5. Text-critical and Philological Notes, Column XIX: 125.

11 "My brother's son" is more concordant than Fitzmyer's "my nephew".

- Sarai was taken away from Abram by force. See my comparison with הַכְּרֵב in 3.5. Text-critical and Philological Notes, Column XX: 138.


- Several titles to denote God are used in this prayer, i.e. אֱלֹהִי (1x), אלהים (2x) and ה' (5x). God is considered the Lord and Ruler over all (ה', 6x). As far as Pharaoh is concerned אלהים is only used in the
negative sense in XX: 15, "May he not have power to defile", which indicates that Pharaoh's power is traced back to God, and that God is able to withhold his power from him.

12* In general, I prefer to translate the waw by "and" in order to keep the rhythm of the story intact, and to indicate the forward movement of the prose (see also Alter 1996: XX). In this translation I have followed Fitzmyer in many instances, although he often does not translate the waw, or replaces a paratactic clause by means of a hypotactic. In this passage I wanted to indicate the forward movement of the prose, hence the repetition of "and".

Abram asks for mercy. This indicates that Abram feels dependent on a Power greater than he, who might do evil to him. The reason for that treatment is his sense of guilt. In XX: 10 Abram acted as Sarai's brother, and negotiated about her marriage to Pharaoh. Hence, he was partly to blame for what happened! In XX: 14 Abram argues that Pharaoh had taken Sarai away from him by force, which he could not resist. That is why he pleads that God mete out justice to Pharaoh for him.

13 AY (1956: 43) translate "Lord of all worlds", and Vermes translates: "Lord of all the worlds" (1995: 295). Fitzmyer thinks that "Possibly the rabbinical expression ... has influenced the original editors here", but suggests the following translation: "Blessed are you, O God Most High, my lord, for all ages" (1971: 129). This seems a better translation to me, since it refers to the fact that God is always there, which is a great comfort for people who are in trouble, such as Abram at this very moment. For the same reason I do not accept García Martínez' translation "through all the universe" (1994: 233).
- I have translated רְאוֹסָן with "Ruler" which conforms to Jastrow (1903: 1583b). Fitzmyer uses the word "Master".

- "For You are the Lord and Ruler over all". Greenfield (1980: XXXII-XXXIII) notes that מַלְאֹן in combination with שלֵׁם "indicates absolute rule and is reminiscent of the titles given Joseph as ruler of Egypt: מַלְאַן and מַלְאַן (Gen. 45: 8)." See his article for more examples. The phrase "power to mete out justice to all", is closely connected with this.

- García Martínez translates כלמה with "everything". I agree with Fitzmyer's translation "all" (see Jastrow 1903: 620a).

- Whereas Fitzmyer leaves out the translation of תָּמִי, I have translated it with "you".

14 Vermes (1995: 295) translates here "I cry now before Thee...", but since טָבַע in the pe'al also means "to complain", and since the context is one of judgement, I prefer Fitzmyer's translation "I lodge a complaint with you..." before also indicates that the complaint is against Pharaoh Zaan. Greenfield (1980: XXXIV) argues that this is a formal statement of charge formulated by Abraham against Pharaoh, and should be translated as follows: "that you took my wife away from me by force". כָּפַט is then, in accordance with an example from legal literature to which Greenfield refers in this article, not passive, "but second person sng. masc. of כָּפַט". After the formal statement Abram turns to God with the plea, "exact from him justice for me" (1980: XXXIV). This switch from God to Pharaoh to God, however, reads a little awkwardly, and I prefer reading "that he has taken my wife away from me" (see also Muraoka 1993: 46).

- By force, הַמִּטָּה, reflects what happened in XIX: 11 (by force). הִמָּטָה indicates "strength, power" (Jastrow 1903: 1655b). The verb מִטָּה means "to
seize, overpower" (Jastrow 1903: 1693b), thus indicating that Abram was no match for Pharaoh, and that Pharaoh acted on purpose. The word נַחֲלָה in XX: 11, however, means "compulsion, force; unavoidable interference, accident" (Jastrow 1903: 29a), which indicates that Abram could not help it. Hence, the strength of the wording in the second instance (in XX: 14) is maximised: Abram is pleading with God, and he wants to make clear to Him, that he could not help what happened; Pharaoh, who planned evil, prevailed over him.

In XX: 18 the word כְּפָרָה is used, which has the same root as כִּפָּר. The following analogy can be made: Pharaoh was overpowered by the plagues and afflictions just like he himself had overpowered Abram and Sarai while abducting her. Pharaoh was punished in the same measure as he mistreated Abram and Sarai. This reminds us of the lex talionis. In XX: 17 is written, that it was not a matter of one person who suffered only, but that his whole house was involved. That, again, is analogous to the suffering in Abram's house as reflected in XX: 10-11.

"your great hand". This Hebrew expression is also used in Exodus 14: 31 "as a figure for a mighty act, which Yahweh had performed against the Egyptians" (Fitzmyer 1971: 130).

Fitzmyer (1971: 65) translates "May he not be able to defile". I have translated "May he not have power to", כָּפָר, because that is more concordant. In XX: 17 I translate בָּלֵא with "able". Kutscher (1965: 31) poses the interesting question, whether it is "... a coincidence that the root כָּפָר occurs in T.O. in the meaning of 'cohabit', e.g. Ex. XXI, 8; Lev. XVIII, 23, etc."
Literally the text says that Abram prays that Pharaoh will not have power to defile his wife *away from*, הַמָּרָא, *him.* Fitzmyer writes that "It is almost impossible to render in English the exact nuance of the separative prep." (1971: 130). Muraoka (1993: 47) also stresses the distancing by the word הַמָּרָא. Greenfield (1980: XXXIV- XXXV) adds to this, that Sarai's defilement would have had very serious implications for Abram and Sarai's marriage.

From Dt. 24:

it may be learned that once a woman had relations with another man, even licit sexual relations, she was יָפֶלֶד 'defiled' as far as her first husband was concerned. This attitude was represented by Philo, by the *Genesis Apocryphon* and also by *Jubilees.* (Greenfield 1980: XXXV)\(^50\)

This rule was also applied to matters of rape, although the Halakhah as assumed in Mishna Ket. 4, 8 "allowed a woman who was raped to be taken back by the husband unless he was a *kohen*" (1980: XXXV). Greenfield indicates that both *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon* represent an "earlier" Halakha, which was later "also the attitude of the Karaites" (1980: XXXV).

Abram prays that Pharaoh will not have power to defile his wife *tonight* only. God does what Abram asked: He sends a pestilential spirit, which makes it impossible for both Pharaoh and his house to have sexual intercourse. Sarai is perfectly safe in Pharaoh's house. This is not only for one night, but for a long period of time. It seems that this period would have lasted eternally, had Horqonwash not intervened. After two years (XX: 18) the situation becomes unbearable, and even then it does not stop.

\(^50\) Note that the word יָפֶלֶד occurs in XX: 15.
Thus, the author shows that God is even more than the Lord and the Ruler over all, He is the Lord of Life! See also XX: 29.

It cannot be proven that the consummation of the marriage is a requirement for the accomplishment of the marriage in ancient Egypt (Pestman 1961: 50-51), but column XX: 30-32 indicates that Pharaoh acted as if Sarai and he were divorced.

God is also presented as a judge, or "Lord and Ruler over all" in Ps. 47: 3, 8; 94: 2-3; and Zech. 14: 9 (see also Fitzmyer (1971: 130).

I have translated "I was silent", because this indicates that Abram has done what he can and now awaits what will happen. Fitzmyer's "I talked to no one" (1971: 130) does not make sense to me, for the sentence stands in the context of a personal prayer. Jastrow (1903: 509b) translates יָכָה, אֲדַלְּמַ, thus: "be silent, quiet".

Gen. 12: 17 runs partly parallel to this sentence, but has the Tetragrammaton at this place. VanderKam argues that this difference did not emerge due to a theological reason, but rather indicates that the Vorlage of the Genesis Apocryphon was "a Hebrew textual variant" (1978: 51).

God reacts immediately. He sends a pestilential spirit, which plagues both Pharaoh and his household. The character of this spirit is described in line 26, where Horqonwash calls it "a spirit of putridity", i.e. spirit causing putria, running, pussy wounds (Fitzmyer 1971: 136-7).

"And all the men". אַלְמָה means (human) being, man (Jastrow 1903: 53a, אַלְמָה, and 82b כלת אַלְמָה). So had best be translated inclusively: "everyone" (see also Dalman 1960: 123: 3). However, in order to translate as concordantly as possible, I have translated "and all the men", since in XX: 19-20 there is talk of אַלְמָתְנֵי בְּגֶהֶן, i.e. "the men of his house". Fitzmyer
has the same translation (1971: 65). 1QapGen XX: 15 and my analysis of that line suggests that an inclusive translation is not even necessary, since it is Pharaoh (and his men) who became impotent. In verse 19 the author names the three troubled groups of men.

Instead of Fitzmyer's "his household" I have translated הבשח with "his house" (see also XX: 17, 18, 20, and 28).

The ṣ in בֵּית ṣ should be a ṣ, hence, one must read בֵּית מֶסֶס, which is described immediately after מֶסֶס. See also Beyer (1984: 175-6). Since he argues that the ṣ in מֶסֶס is a hearing error, it can be derived that he does not agree with Vermes et al. who consider the Genesis Apocryphon an autograph (see also 1.3.5. The Date of the Narrative: 27-28).

For the translation "pestilential spirit" see Fitzmyer (1971: 131) where he also mentions that the "belief in spirits as the cause of illness or misfortunes was common in the time of the composition of this work". In the Genesis tradition Gen. 12 does not provide information on the character of the diseases with which Pharaoh and his house were plagued. Gen. 20: 17, however, tells that the wombs of all in Abimelech's house were closed. Fitzmyer thinks that "The explanation of the nature of the 'pestilential spirit' should undoubtedly be sought along lines such as these." However, this would have consequences as to Sarai's purity since her closed womb would not avoid Pharaoh from having intercourse with her. There must be a reason why Pharaoh did not even touch (or approach) her as XX: 17 says. Brownlee (1964: 76) suggests impotence, which is very likely when one considers the following quotes from column XX of the Genesis Apocryphon:
(15) May he not have power to defile my wife from me tonight... (16) ...a pestilential spirit to afflict him and all the men of his house, an evil spirit, (17) that kept afflicting him and all the men of his house. And he was not able to touch her, much less did he know her... (18) ...At the end of two years the plagues and afflictions held him firmly, and prevailed over him and over all the men of his house... (19) ...if they could cure him of this plague, and the men (20) of his house. But none of the physicians, the enchanters, nor any of the wise men were able to rise up and cure him, for it came to pass that the spirit afflicted all of them (21) and they fled.

It is clear from the course of the story that it was the author's concern that especially the men were afflicted. This served two objects: Sarai remained as pure as she had been before, and Pharaoh remained impotent to approach her.

17 "and he was unable to touch her". Here I follow Muraoka's suggestion to translate לַמְדֹּקֶר בָּהָה by "to touch her", for which he provides several examples in his article "The Aramaic of the Genesis Apocryphon" (1972: 33). Fitzmyer's translation is "to approach her".

- Pharaoh is not able to touch, לַמְדֹּקֶר, Sarai. This is a word-play with הָרֹדָה (af el הָרֹדָה) in XXI: 2. In connection with Pharaoh, הָרֹדָה is used for a sexual relationship with a woman; in connection with Abram it is used to denote his relationship with God.

- "and he was unable to touch her". Bernstein categorises this as an assimilationist harmonisation, for it seems as if the author of the Genesis Apocryphon combined sentences from Gen. 12 and 20 in this phrase (1996: 49).

- I have translated אֶל אִית in accordance with García Martinez (1994: 233): "much less", since that is the best way to bring home the message. It is a
conclusio a minori ad maius. Dupont-Sommer translates "Moreover, he knew her not for as long as he was with her" (1961: 287).

I have followed Vermes (1995: 295) in literally translating as was presuming that the meaning "nor did he have intercourse with her", as Fitzmyer (1971: 132) puts it, is well-known.

Fitzmyer translates with "though he was with her (?) for two years". I prefer the following translation: "though she was with him for two years", for

1) all through the manuscript Sarai is not referred to with but with קִנְיָן. 2) I understand this passage thus: Sarai is taken into Pharaoh's house, so she is "with him" (like chez lui in French, see also XX: 23), but that does not mean that they are together all the time. Fitzmyer writes that this translation "is not wholly impossible", and thus shows a great reluctance to accept it, but he also thinks that the version I choose fits better in the context (1971: 133).

"for two years". Brownlee (1964: 76) suggests that this period of time is derived "from the account in Jubilees, where the author may very well have been influenced by Gen. 20".

Fitzmyer translates "...the plagues and afflictions became more severe and more intense for him and all the men of his household." I have translated this more literally using Jastrow's dictionary which reads about פָּשַׁל, "to seize, hold firmly" (1903: 1693b), and about פָּשַׁל "to be uppermost, prevail; to be strong" (1903: 208b).

At the end of this line it is Pharaoh who sends for all the wise men of Egypt, whereas in XX: 16 it is God who sends an evil spirit. The power of
people is contrasted with God's power; and, of course, God's power prevails.

19 I have translated רַעֵש with "enchanter" instead of Fitzmyer's "magician" (Jastrow 1903: 129b).

- For נבָא, which is a form common in Qumran writings, see Fitzmyer (1971: 133-134).

- Fitzmyer notes:

  the motif of the failure of the non-Jewish experts to aid the king; cf. Dn 2. 2ff.; 5. 7; Gn 41. 8; Ex 7. 11; Is 19. 11-13. On the other hand, it is not impossible that Ex. 8. 18 also influenced the composition here" (1971: 133).

20 The spirit is referred to with a masculine form: נבָא. Muraoka suggests that:

  If ... one wishes to retain the text as it stands ..., the only possible explanation we can think of is that in the author's mind the ultimate cause of the plague, i.e. God, and his agent, i.e. the evil spirit, were mixed up" (1972: 16).

- "But none... were able to rise up and cure him". There is a curse on Pharaoh's house which afflicts everyone before they can do anything, so that the people who were summoned to come and cure the king, fled and left Pharaoh as he was before. It seems strange that they cannot rise up, נבָא, to cure him, but that they can flee. There are three solutions to the problem:

- 1) we must not take "rise up" literally. It can also refer to setting oneself to a task (Jastrow 1903: 1331b).

- 2) Fitzmyer (1971: 134) considers this a pleonastic use of נבָא, which he translates "to rise up" (see also XX: 29).
3) Vermes (1995: 296), on the other hand, translates דָּלַל with "stay". Staying in Pharaoh's house would then cause trouble. This translation can also be found in Davidson's lexicon (657: III), and "to remain" is twice suggested by Jastrow (1903: 1331a). The consequence would then be, that the evil spirit had influence upon everybody, who stayed in Pharaoh's house for a while. However, Horqonwash, who has a close relationship with Pharaoh as we can deduce from the fact that he was a prince (XIX: 24), and from his description of Sarai before Pharaoh (XX: 2-8), is able to come to Abram to ask his help without any reference to his difficulty to rise and go (see XX: 21). Since the text does not provide information as to God's possible intervention with the result that Horqonwash was able to rise and go to Abram, Vermes' translation cannot be correct. That is why I choose the translation of setting oneself to a task, here especially in connection with healing. Horqonwash could set himself to the task of going to Abram to ask his help, but the Egyptian healers were not able to set themselves to the task of healing. The power of the evil spirit was probably so great, that it even prevented actions against its effects. Here I must emphasise the fact that it is difficult to make distinction between God's works and those of the spirit, as Muraoka rightly remarks (1972: 16; and above, in XX: 20). For the ability of Horqonwash to set himself to a task, see XX: 21 below.

"none of the physicians, the enchanters, nor any of the wise men". All these forms are masculine plural, status determinativus (Rosenthal 1983: 23). However, this does not exclude women, but it seems unrealistic in the light of the context where Sarai's security against defilement, and especially Pharaoh's inability to touch Sarai, is discussed. See especially lines 15 and 17 in column XX: 12-21.
"none of the physicians, the enchanters, nor any of the wise men". The fact that the physicians were not able to heal Pharaoh is striking, especially when one considers the fact that they were so highly esteemed in Egypt that some of them were deified and worshipped accordingly, such as Imhotep, who was a physician to king Zoser about 3000 B.C.E. (Duckat 1971: 171-172). The enchanters were Egyptian priests who practised sorcery. Duckat writes about them:

As royal magicians, they were at the beck and call of the royal family. These priestly scholars were attached to the temples and were required to be of unblemished appearance. Undergoing long periods of preparation followed by initiation into the rites, they studied the art of the House of Life, which contained the textbooks of the system. At the completion of their training, they could recite the proper spell for every occasion, and they knew all the ceremonies and traditions related to sorcery. They became the hartumim, magicians of the Bible (Gen. 41: 8). (1971: 129; italics are Duckat's.)

It is striking that the enchanters, priests who had studied the art of the House of Life, and who might thus be considered specialists in the field of matters of life and death are totally powerless. They themselves are even subjected to the plague. In this narrative neither the physicians nor the enchanters can be of any help to Pharaoh, since they represent powers inferior to God. This is in agreement with narratives in Ex. 7: 8-12; 9: 8-11; 12: 29-32; Num. 22: 1-24: 25; and Dan. 5: 1-12.

Knibb states correctly that:

The failure of the Egyptian wise men to heal the Pharaoh is reminiscent of the failure of the Egyptian magicians to interpret Pharaoh's dream (Gen. 41: 8), and of the similar failure of the Babylonian wise men in the narratives about Daniel (Dan. 2: 2-13; 4: 6-7; 5: 7-9); but cp. also Exod. 8: 18-19. (1994: 193)
For "it came to pass that..." see XIX: 11.

21* הָכָה occurs several times in this narrative, i.e. in XIX: 19, 21, and XX: 9, 12 and 21. It could not be translated concordant, for the different meanings of הָכוּ had to be taken into account. In the following I write those different meanings in bold letters. In XIX: 19, 21 Abram explains the dream to Sarai and tells her, "[ ] who will seek to kill me and leave you (alone)" (XIX: 19), and "[ ] they will seek] to [take] you away from me and to kill me" (XIX: 21). In XX: 9 Pharaoh sought to kill Abram. In XIX: 19, 21 and XX: 9 הָכָה is used in an evil context. In XX: 12 and 21, however, הָכָה is used in connection with God. In XX: 12 Abram entreated during his prayer; whereas in XX: 21 Horqonwash begged Abram to help the king. Here Abram functions as a mediator between Horqonwash and God.

It is interesting that where הָכוּ is used in connection with "they", the הָכוּ from Psalm 114: 1, in XX: 9 represented by the ultimate foreigner in persona, Pharaoh, the word introduces an evil act, i.e. הָכוּ. However, when it is connected with people seeking God, it leads to the solution of the problem caused by the seeking of the evil "them". If one would apply terms familiar to those of the Qumran community, one could describe the people seeking God as "children of light", whereas the people seeking evil could be called "children of darkness". It must be noted, however, that this terminology does not occur anywhere in this scroll!

Although Horqonwash was one of the men who were close to Pharaoh, and although one could accordingly expect that he would also be affected by the evil spirit, he was able to come to Abram. The reason is that Horqonwash made himself available to be an instrument of God when God
had shown Abram in Horqonwash's dream\textsuperscript{51}. Consequently, the evil spirit, which was also an instrument of God, stepped back and let him do what had to be done.

- Literally: "that I should come and pray for". In this text I have consistently translated "to pray for" whereas Fitzmyer also translates "to pray over".

- Fitzmyer (1971: 134) writes, that Abram's prayer for Pharaoh "is a detail most likely derived from the parallel story of Abram and Abimelech in Gn 20. 17. It is, however, greatly embellished."

According to Beyer this is the only healing by laying on of hands in Jewish literature. In the New Testament tradition it occurs only once in connection with a prayer:

> In den zahlreichen neustamentlichen Beispielen fehlt das Gebet, außer Apg. 28, 8, wo Paulus einen fiebrigen Durchfall durch Gebet und Handauflegung heilt. (Beyer 1984: 176)

- I have translated בֵּית הָאָלָל with: "that he might live". "That he might recover" is also a good translation (see Jastrow 1903: 454a). However, since the text suggests that Pharaoh and his house have become impotent, the result of which could be extinction of the family, I have reflected the concept of life in the translation (see also XX: 23).

- Beyer (1984: 176- 7) reads [כ ב]ה[תל]לנשׁ בֵּית הָאָלָל, whereas Fitzmyer reads [כ ב]ה[ת]לנשׁ בֵּית הָאָלָל. What Beyer reads between the second set of brackets is unreadable to me, but I also read "כ ב" before it. What follows is conjecture, both in Fitzmyer's and in Beyer's work. But the difference in meaning is not great.

\textsuperscript{51} The origin of the dream is not ascribed to God, although this is certainly the implication. See XIX: 14.
"Abram, my uncle, cannot", impf. m. sg. pe'al \(\text{לָא} \) This is a verbal sentence. The word-order in Aramaic is not important. An object may both follow and precede the verb without any implications as to emphasis etc. (BL 1962: 339 §100p). The negation \( \text{לָא} \) always stands before the negated word (BL 1962: 348, §104a). Hence, the word-order is normal.

"my uncle, my father's brother" (Jastrow 1903: 283a). It emphasises that they belong together. It is possible that Lot was not only indignant because of the way Pharaoh treated Abram, but that he also feared that his uncle would be taken away from him, just like his father, who died in Ur of the Chaldees (Gen. 11: 27-28), and his aunt, who was abducted (XX: 9). Abram's close relationship to Lot is also described in \(1\text{QapGen XX: 11, 34; XXI: 5, and XXII: 3, and Gen. 11: 27.}\)

The very fact that Pharaoh's servant comes to plead for the very man who has robbed Abram of his wife probably rouses Lot's indignation, and then the unravelling of the plot takes place.

Fitzmyer has translated "his wife Sarai". Although this is a possible translation I have followed the order in Aramaic, which lays emphasis on the fact that Sarai is not Pharaoh's wife, but Abram's. Fitzmyer indicates this by translating "to her own husband" further on in the sentence (emphasis is mine).

I have translated \( \text{בָּא} \) with "be gone" in accordance with XX: 27, where Pharaoh says the same to Abram. In the two contexts it is to be expected that the speaker is irritated and does not simply say "go" as Fitzmyer has it.

Lot seizes the opportunity to tell Horqonwash how the situation really is. Lot plays an active role. He is no longer the young orphan who went to
Canaan with his uncle and aunt, but somebody who intervenes in his old uncle's life. One might argue that Lot draws power unto himself in anticipation of being Abram's heir. If so, he does not strive for material profit, but for justice. In that sense he is an instrument of God. Moreover, it is very doubtful whether Lot really acts in anticipation of being Abram's heir, as can be seen in the following:

a) Lot speaks very authoritatively: "Now be gone, say...!", שָׁם and שֶׁם are imperative. The angry young man acts like a prophet, and does not fear to address the prince by means of imperative and figures of speech. This indicates that he is not speaking on behalf of himself, but, once again, that he is God's instrument. Note, that Lot's words to Horqonwash, "Now be gone, tell the king that he should send his wife away from him, to her husband. Then he will pray for him that he might live", form an assimilationist harmonisation with God's words to Abimelech in Gen. 20: 7, "Now then, return the man's wife; for he is a prophet, and he will pray for you and you shall live". See also Bernstein (1996: 49- 50).

b) "Now be gone, tell...!" is an asyndeton. This clipped speech emphasises that only by doing what Lot says the problem can be solved. Horqonwash had better act immediately. The injustice should not last any longer:

גֹּשַׁה נְשָׁה לְבָא בְּבֵית אוֹתִּי הָאָרָחָה בְּבֵית אֲבֹאָהּ לְבָא בְּבֵית אוֹתִּי הָאָרָחָה

The injustice should not last any longer:

c) Lot uses irony to bring home the message: "tell the king that he should send his wife away from him, to her husband" (emphasis is mine). Although he describes Sarai as Pharaoh's wife, Pharaoh has to send her to her husband, i.e. her real husband, from whom he abducted her, and whom he wanted to kill at first. That is the price of life, in the sense of continued
existence. Perhaps Lot also mocks with Pharaoh's impotence; Pharaoh has not been able to know Sarai, so he cannot even be considered her husband. Fitzmyer writes about Lot's intervention: "This detail differs from other paraphrases of the Gn story in antiquity" (1971: 135). In sources such as Josephus and Eupolemus it is either Egyptian priests, or seers, who tell Pharaoh that Sarai is already married (1971: 135). In the Genesis Apocryphon the narrator did not describe them as such, probably since they are pagans who are not worthy of revealing the ways of God. This is, again, a reason to consider Lot an instrument of God.

24* The imperatives in XX: 23 formed an asyndetic parataxis, and so do the perfecta in XX: 24: he went "and" said.

"All these plagues and afflictions (25) with which my lord, the king, is plagued and afflicted". Fitzmyer uses "beset" instead of "plagued".

25 "My lord, the king" is an honorific substitute for the 2nd pers. masc. sg. (see Muraoka 1972: 10). The word "lord" occurs several times in this pericope, i.e. in XX: 12, 13, 14, 15 (2x), 25 and XXI: 2. In all instances it is Abram who uses the word to address and describe God, except in XX: 25, where it is used by Horqonwash in his address to Pharaoh. The narrator shows hereby that the only real "lord" is the Lord, God, and that Pharaoh is one of the kings subjected to Him as described in Abram's prayer in XX: 13.

Fitzmyer translates לְפַּרְחֶם as "due to", which could indicate that Sarai is the origin of the plagues. Although it is possible that Horqonwash intended to say "due to", in order to shift the blame from Pharaoh, I have translated "for
the sake of" to indicate that the evil power brought the plagues to help Sarai. My translation is in accordance with Jastrow (1903: 140a).

- AY, Fitzmyer and JLVDW read דְּרֵא, whereas Beyer reads in this line. There seems to be no space for an aleph. Hence, I prefer reading דְּרֵא.

The previous three read an af el jussive 3 m. pl. (Jastrow 1903: 1649b), whereas Beyer (1984: 177) reads an af el imp. 2 m. pl. of the same root הָרָא. "Gebt doch Sarai".

- "Let them return Sarai" is "a likely case of the honorific impersonal intended to avoid direct address to the king, or in other words, a substitute for TTYB or 'TYB (imperative)" (Muraoka 1972: 30). Horqonwash explains the situation to Pharaoh and pleads politely for Sarai's release. Fitzmyer translates this passively: "Let Sarai be returned" and does not translate יָרָא.

- For Fitzmyer's translation "her husband, Abram" see 3.5. Text-critical and Philological Notes, Column XX: 151.

26 Fitzmyer reads יָרָא in accordance with AY's edition, although Fitzmyer agrees that "it is more difficult to explain" (1971: 136). Instead, Greenfield (1980: 37-38) follows Greenberg and Kutscher (1958: 31) in reading יָרָא, for which he sees no palaeographical objection. Although the space is rather limited for a resh, I think that it is not impossible that it is a resh. I have adopted Greenfield's version, for his arguments seem sound to me. He concludes:

The root יָרָא is well attested for expelling a person from a house, a people from a land, and also for divorce. Indeed in the Aramaic Incantation Texts the divorce formula containing this root was used for expelling Liliths and other spirits. (1980: 37-38)
Jastrow (1903: 1699a) translates the Pa'el of בָּרַכְתּ thus: "1) to drive out, divorce, banish".

The result will be that Abram will drive out the plague from Pharaoh, as well as the spirit of purulence. This is a parallelismus membrorum; the spirit, of course, is the cause of the plague. By mentioning both plague and spirit, Horqonwash wants to make clear that the plague will be totally eliminated. Here is no mention of prayer, as in the conversation with Lot.


Verb-Subject-Object is possibly the original word-order in Aramaic (BL 1962: 342-344; §101b). However, one of the characteristics of Aramaic is the great freedom of word-order (Ibid. §101a). In biblical Aramaic, Subject-Verb-Object is the most frequently used order, but there are, except for the two orders mentioned here, four more noted word-orders in biblical Aramaic (§101a-i). Kutscher (1965: 28) writes that the spelling of 1QapGen "seems to reflect 'Reichsaramäisch' usage..., later than B.A., which merely tends towards this stage, but earlier than Palmyrene..." Hence, the rules of biblical Aramaic do not apply here. However, the freedom of word-order in Aramaic leads to the conclusion that there is no reason to favour one reading above the other due to the word-order. Qimron (1992: 16-17) agrees with AY and Fitzmyer on palaeographical grounds.

"Why have you repeatedly said to me" is a translation of Beyer's reading בָּרַכְתּ, "Warum hast du mir immer wieder gesagt" (Only
above the  כ Beyer writes a circle to indicate uncertainty). I agree with Beyer. AY (1956: XX), Fitzmyer (1971: 64), and JLvdW (1976: 100) read בָּאָרָה אֵלָה. Beyer's reading is very different from the traditional, since this reproach makes clear, that Abram did not remain silent after his wife had said that he was her brother (see XX: 10), but that he had repeated the story over and over! Qimron (1992: 17) also prefers Beyer's reading, since it "fits the traces and is linguistically and contextually preferable: this being simply a paraphrase of Gen. 12: 19". In Gen. 12: 19, however, Pharaoh speaks in the perfectum (יָצָא), a tense which is used to state something, and which is often used as a punctualis with a preterite meaning. It can indicate lack of change in a certain action, but it does not suggest repetition (Lettinga 1976: 164- 165). Hence, this is an instance where the author of the Genesis Apocryphon has intervened in the rendering of the narrative. יָצֵא would well illustrate Pharaoh's zeal to plead himself free from guilt.

"What have you done to me, why have you repeatedly said (27) to me: 'She's my sister', when she was your wife? And I took her to me as wife!". Weinfeld states that this story in the Genesis Apocryphon strengthens Cassuto's hypothesis that there is a connection between the Assyrian Law and the biblical account of Sarah in Abimelech's house (Weinfeld 1985: 435). In the Genesis Apocryphon, however, it is not Abimelech who takes Sarah into his house, but Pharaoh who takes Sarai into his house. The Apocryphon combines the two stories. It makes, however:

no difference from the legal standpoint whether he slept with her or not, as is clear from section 14 of the Assyrian law which states that a man who slept with a woman not knowing that she is married is exempt from punishment. (Weinfeld 1985: 433)
Hence, the main thing was that he should be unaware of her being married (that is why he wanted to emphasise his innocence). While using a pun one might say, knowing Sarai was no trespass if Pharaoh did not know that she was married. However, if Pharaoh had known that she was married to Abram, and if he had taken her into his house anyway, he would have committed a trespass. In order to be cleared of the guilt the Assyrian law required from Pharaoh to make an oath that he did not know that she was married. And furthermore, he had to compensate for the wrong, which had been done (Weinfeld 1985: 433-435). According to Cassuto (1974: 357-8) a man, who transported a woman from one place to another had to make an oath that he had not lain with her, as soon as he found out that the woman was married. This would fit well in XX: 30. Vermes' suggestion that Pharaoh swore friendship with Abram (1961: 115) seems somewhat naive, taking into consideration his behaviour towards Abram and the fact that he provided an escort to him in order to leave the country.

27 For the reversed word-order, see XIX: 20 and XX: 10.

- מָֽלְתִּי Fitzmyer (1971: 137) writes: "It is the basic text of Gn 12.19 which influences the account here, despite the adoption of the wording of Gn 20.13 in 19.20", מָֽלְתִּי.

- "took her to me as wife!" Fitzmyer translates "took her to be my wife". My translation is more literal and suggests that Pharaoh was more intimate with

---

52 Weinfeld makes the following interesting remark in his summary (1985: 435): "we still do not know how to connect a practice of the middle of the second millennium B.C.E. with sources dating 1500 years later." Strictly spoken, he is right, nothing stated in this section is proven. Cassuto's hypothesis remains a hypothesis, albeit interesting.
Sarai than in Fitzmyer's version. Pharaoh does not want to acknowledge his impotence in front of a stranger.

- AY read הבאה instead of הבאה, which we find in Fitzmyer. The passage is unreadable to me. However, Fitzmyer's reading seems better, because it fits better in the course of the story as we know it. AY's version suggests, that Pharaoh tells Abram to behold his wife, who is with Pharaoh, and then to go. This would mean that Sarai would remain with Pharaoh, which is not the case, since the Genesis Apocryphon follows the biblical narrative about Sarai's barrenness as can be deduced from XXI: 27- XXIII. Dupont-Sommer follows AY (1961: 288).

- In agreement with XIX: 14, I have translated גרה with "look". It also emphasises Pharaoh's clipped speech.

- For "be gone" see XX: 23.

- בא and ל. In connection with בא in Gen. 12: 1 Muraoka (1978: 49?) emphasises the centripetal force in case of a construction of verbs of motion followed by the preposition ג with pronominal suffix (see 2.2.3. Notes: 44). Although this is not a Hebrew, but an Aramaic text, this phenomenon can be found here too, and I am inclined to think that it works in the same way here, although neither Dalman nor BL write about this phenomenon.

28 García Martínez (1994: 234) translates בכל מצרים מצורים as "all the cities of Egypt". I prefer to translate "all the provinces of Egypt", since it is likely that Pharaoh does not want him to remain in any jurisdictional district of his country anymore, for XX: 32 mentions the escort, which has to make sure that Abram leaves Egypt. Abram is excluded from the whole country, not only from the cities (see Jastrow 1903: 734a). Fitzmyer also translates "all
the provinces”, and gives a detailed report thereof. There he also writes that he is not certain whether "province" (יִדְרָם) was written in plural, for the waw is missing in the scroll (1971: 137-8). However, in XX: 34 the author spelled the word יְדָרָם, which undoubtedly is meant in the plural sense, also without the waw. Hence, this might be one of his peculiarities.

Here Pharaoh himself commands Abram to pray for him, probably in exchange for Sarai. He does not plead, but commands as a real ruler would. The form of הניח which is used here is an imperative. Even under the given circumstances he keeps his stature.


"So I prayed for [...]“ AY (1956: 22) read: דַּלְתָּה הַכִּים (29) אֲשֶׁר [...] (29), whereas Fitzmyer reads the last three letters of this line and the first two of the next line thus: דַּלְתָּה הַכִּים [...] (29) אֲשֶׁר [...]. Fitzmyer (1971: 139) assumes that some term describing Pharaoh was used in the lacuna at the end of line 28 and the beginning of line 29. JLVdW (1976: 100-101) read the end of this line thus: "So I prayed that he be cured…", דַּלְתָּה הַכִּים [...] (29) אֲשֶׁר [...] (29). Beyer (1984: 177-8) reads: "Und ich betete für ihn zu seiner Heilung", דַּלְתָּה הַכִּים [...] (29) אֲשֶׁר [...] (29). The last two readings do not differ much from each other, and can be considered to be interesting solutions after the process of interpretation, which can be seen in this section. I do not read the waw which Beyer reads at the very end of XX: 28. I consider the solutions mentioned above as to what was written in the lacuna conjecture. In agreement with Jongeling (1980: 301) I do not expect the author to use
a descriptive term such as "that blasphemer", or "that persecutor" in this context, as Fitzmyer suggests, and on the grounds of the context it seems likely to me that some form of וַיְבִלְּפֶה must be read here. Hence, I opt for JLVdW's version.

"So I prayed for" Here the author has again inserted material, viz. from Gen. 20:17, where a prayer for Abimelech is mentioned.

For the repetition of "and" see XX: 12.

For "the laying- on of hands", see also XX: 22. By allowing Abram to lay his hands upon his head, the highest part of his royal highness, Pharaoh acknowledges both that the spirit is more powerful than he himself, and that Abram as representative of God is even more powerful than the spirit. What Abram has prayed in XX: 15-16, "that it may be known about You, my Lord, that You are the Lord of all the kings of the earth!", has come true.

Fitzmyer (1971: 140-141) writes that many scholars have detected some sort of rite in the imposition of hands in order to heal Pharaoh. He discusses this, but concludes that there is no evidence that this is an Essene theological factor, or that Abram performs here a cultic, or soteriological act.

and are both divine passives, indicating that it is God who acts. The result is לֹּא הָיִה, which is another indication that the God of life is involved (see XX: 9, above). Hence, I consider Nickelsburg's statement that "the account of Pharaoh's affliction and healing is narrated as a contest in which Abram accomplishes what the Egyptian magicians and healers cannot do" superficial (1998: 147, see also 149). God is considered a living being in the Genesis Apocryphon. Hence, His activity cannot be denied
(see esp. XX: 12-20 and XXI: 3-4). It is not Abram who is the major character, as Nickelsburg states (1998: 147), but God! See also 3.6. The Structure of 1QapGen XIX: 7 till XXI: 4: 179.

AY (1956: 22) read the end of this line, and lines 30 and 31 thus:

Fitzmyer (1971: 66) reads:

Fitzmyer is very cautious about changing AY's work. His translation is:

and he was cured. And the king rose (and) [made] known (30) to me [ ]; and the king swore an oath to me that [he had] not [touched her?]. And then [they brought] (31) Sarai to [me]. And the king gave her. (1971: 67)

JL.VdW read this in a very different way:

Muraoka has compared אַ י [א] אַ י א from Fitzmyer's restoration of the text with II Kings 13: 21, which makes him doubt whether Fitzmyer is correct when stating that there is a case of pleonastic אַ י in XX: 29. He argues that אַ י should probably be read with the preceding א (1972: 42). אַ י would thus be the visualisation of Pharaoh's restored health in אַ י. Although this is an interesting view, I prefer my translation which one can read both literally, and as a way to say that someone sets himself to do something (Jastrow 1903: 1331b). See also 3.5. Text- Critical and Philological Notes, Column XX: 145. In the pericope there is no speech of Pharaoh staying in bed due to illness as Muraoka's translation would suggest.
meaning:
and he recovered. Then the king rose and gave (30) me on that day
many gifts and the king swore me with an oath that he had not....her
and ....her. And he brought back to me (31) Sarai. Then the king
gave her. (1976: 100-101)

I do not read בְּשָּׁם on CD-Rom. It reads more like some form of בְּשָׁמַי.

JLVdW read instead of Fitzmyer’s. [בְּשָּׁמַי rather than בְּשָּׁם. ]
When I read the microfiche I cannot but consider this a conjecture.

Fitzmyer’s [דְּבָרָה] is read as אֱלָהִית in JLVdW’s version. Since the text is
unreadable there, I consider the two versions conjectures.

Beyer (1984: 176-7) reads:

und er wurde wiederhergestellt. Und der König gab (30) mir [...] viele Geschenke. Und der König schwur mir mit einem Eide, daß er
ihr nicht beigewohnt und sie (daher auch) nicht befleckt habe. Und
er gab mir (31) Sarai zurück. Und der König gab ihr.

Beyer reads מְבָרָך. This is an Ittaf al, a reflexive-passive stem of the af el,
which can be translated: "to be placed" (Jastrow 1903: 1332a). In the
Ithpa’al it can also mean "to be restored". The translation seems somewhat
forced in order to fit in the context. Moreover, I read יָדַּק, which is in agreement with AY and Fitzmyer.

Concerning the reading of כְּלָא and see my comment on the version of JLVdW. Fitzmyer’s version, which I choose for my translation, and which follows Kutscher’s suggestion as to [א] (1965: 31), seems to be more neutral; why should Pharaoh give something in return for the healing? It also fits better in the context where there is also talk of swearing an oath (see XX: 31).

Beyer interprets Fitzmyer’s אָכַּב: [רְחַב] אָכַּב[...]. Fitzmyer’s version reflects what is discernable. No trace of Beyer’s lamed can be found on CD-Rom. Therefore, this must be considered conjecture.

Both JLVdW and Beyer read אָכַּב. It is likely that a ruler such as Pharaoh would order his men to bring Sarai to Abram. If he returned her himself he would, by this very act, acknowledge guilt. Since he denies that very strongly in XX: 26-28, JLVdW’s version misses the point.

However, bringing Sarai to Abram himself could also be interpreted as an act of good-will. But since Abram was merely an alien fleeing the famine in his country, Pharaoh would humiliate himself by doing so. Pharaoh had already been humiliated by the fact that he had to return Sarai, whom he had not even been able to touch. He would certainly not relish being humiliated again.

Of course it is possible that the author of the Genesis Apocryphon could have written the story according to JLVdW’s and Beyer’s interpretation in
order to show Abram's greatness\textsuperscript{54}: even Pharaoh humbled himself before him, and had to acknowledge his greatness as a result of his walking with God. However, since Fitzmyer's reading agrees better with what I can discern on CD-Rom, and since it fits better in the context, and since it also contains less conjecture, I prefer his version.

30 It is not known what the king made known to Abram, or what he swore. With the description of Sarai's beauty and Pharaoh's reaction to it (XX: 2-9) in mind, it is hard to believe him swearing that he had not touched her. Nickelsburg reads the passage in a very attractive and humoristic way:

ironically, after an evil spirit keeps Pharaoh from consummating the relationship, the king swears an oath to Abram that he has not had intercourse with her. (1998: 151)

Fitzmyer writes that the restoration "that he had not touched her" "seems demanded by the context, but it is difficult to supply the proper verb; there are some traces of letters which make a form of l\textit{m}', 'to defile', rather difficult" (1971: 141). Analogous with my comment on XX: 26* I should think that he made known that he had not known that Sarai was married, and that he had not lain with her, after which he was supposed to give compensation to the husband. This would also be consistent with Pharaoh's speech in XX: 26-28.

"and look, they brought Sarai to me." This is a moving moment about which the author does not elaborate. According to XX: 18-32 Abram sees his wife after more than two years. The text does not tell exactly how long

\textsuperscript{54} Lange (1996: 202) concludes in his form-critical study of the \textit{Genesis Apocryphon} that one of its \textit{Vorlagen} was a wisdom didactic narrative. The aim of such a narrative is to express both the virtues and the abilities of a hero. Hence, the need to emphasise the greatness of the hero.
Sarai remained in Pharaoh's house. 1QapGen XXII: 27-29 merely refers to a seven year stay in Egypt, of which five years are spent in peace (XIX: 23), which are again followed by a two year stay in Pharaoh's house.

"they brought Sarai to me." This refers to XX: 25: "Let them return Sarai", and to XX: 27: "Look, your wife; take her away".

For the translation "look" see the notes on XIX: 14.

31 הָלַךְ לַעֲבָדֶיהָ. Fitzmyer (1971: 142) rightly remarks that "Abram is still the speaker apparently", so that הָלַךְ can only refer to Sarai.

"And the king gave". Vermes writes in his Scripture and Tradition, that Pharaoh offered presents to Abram "through Sarai" (1961: 115). According to Vermes the author of the Genesis Apocryphon omitted Pharaoh's act of giving presents to Abram during Sarai's abduction as narrated in Gen. 12: 16, in order to show that "Abraham is indebted to Sarah for his life but not for his prosperity" (1961: 114). Vermes continues that the material about the giving of presents was borrowed from Gen. 20 in order to compensate for the omission of Gen. 12: 16. "The Patriarch obtained his riches, not because he had handed over his wife, but for curing the king" (1961: 115-116). However, due attention should be paid to the fact that Pharaoh gave to Sarai, as can be seen below.

"And the king gave". After Sarai has been returned to Abram Pharaoh gives "her [mu]ch [silver and go]ld, numerous garments of fine linen and purple [... and he put them] (32) before her, and also Hagar." According to Mace there are numerous examples in the Hebrew Bible which indicate "that the wife might possess property of her own" (1953: 176). When she got betrothed, her husband had to pay a mohar to her father in exchange for his renouncement of patria potestas, and in order to indicate the
established covenant between the two families where both lost someone, and also acquired someone, so that they shared a similar fate (1953: 171-172). On the occasion of the wedding the bride received a gift from her bridegroom, and a dowry from her father which was often part of the mohar\textsuperscript{55}. It seems as if it was customary in the patriarchal story that the dowry was a handmaid (1953: 175-176: Gen. 16: 1; 24: 59; 24: 61; 29: 24; 29: 29. However, the author suggests that Sarai was abducted. Therefore, it is not likely that she received a handmaid as dowry. The wife could use her bridegroom's gift and her dowry to her own liking (1953: 167). Thus, her possessions were not included in those of the husband, as Vermes suggested, or in the possessions belonging to the family which she established with her husband. This is illustrated by my explanation of XX: 33 in \textit{3.5. Text-critical and Philological Notes, Column XX: 171}.

"And the king gave". An interesting phenomenon takes place; the king gives to Sarai, not to Abram! QapGen XX: 32 says that after he has given his gifts to Sarai, Sarai is handed over to Abram, wherein Pharaoh in a certain sense, gives both Sarai and the gifts to Abram. By acting thus, he might want to indicate that he is not liable to pay compensation to a liar (XX: 26-27). Again, it is not Abram who receives the goods, but Sarai. Below, I try to sort out why:

\textsuperscript{55} De Vaux holds that wives were purchased in the patriarchal era. Hence, he does not agree that the bride received a dowry, but fails to explain sufficiently why: "It is difficult to reconcile any such custom (i.e. dowry, JW- H) with the payment of the mohar by the bridegroom." See Goodman 1965: 72. However, Mace states convincingly, that "the phrase 'marriage by purchase', taken literally, is virtually a contradiction in terms; for what is truly purchase cannot properly be described as marriage, and what is worthy of the name of marriage is essentially something other than purchase. Marriage in any case, as has been pointed out, is probably an older institution than purchase, and cannot therefore be derived from the latter." (1953: 171).
"And the king gave..." In XX: 8b-9 it is said that Pharaoh loved Sarai very much, and that he marvelled at all her beauty and took her as wife. This might have induced him to draw up a deed in which he allotted important rights of property to her, since Egyptian wives also had certain rights of property (Pestman 1961: 182). However, since no allusion to a deed occurs in the *Genesis Apocryphon*, this must be rejected.

It is possible that these gifts to Sarai contain the šp n s.h m.t<sup>+</sup>, i.e. the "price or compensation for (marrying) a woman" (Pestman 1961: 17), which the husband in ancient Egypt had to give to his wife at the moment of divorce. Originally, this was a gift, which the bridegroom used to make to the bride's father. In doing so, he broke the family tie between the father of the bride and his daughter, and formed a new one between the bride and himself, the bridegroom. Later on, the bridegroom does not give the gift to the father anymore, but to the bride, thereby establishing the marriage tie (Pestman 1961: 50 and 108). Still later, from about 230 B.C.E. onwards, "this gift is made fictitiously, and only has to be paid in fact in the case of dissolution of the marriage" (Pestman 1961: 50 and 110). The passage in the *Genesis Apocryphon* seems to reflect the latter, since Column XX: 10, "while I was negotiating about what concerned her", does not state that either Sarai or Abram received a šp when Pharaoh took her into his house. Hence, I conclude that the author described the practice as known from 230 B.C.E. onwards.

According to the *Genesis Apocryphon* Sarai receives beautiful, precious gifts. This is not in accord with the regular practice concerning the šp in

---
56 Henceforth indicated by šp.
Egypt at the time when the narrative of the *Genesis Apocryphon* was written.\textsuperscript{57} The $\mathcal{S}p$:

consists of an amount of money -sometimes of a quantity of corn at the same time- of a value which is often very modest .... for the time of the Pharaohs after 500 B.C., and ... for the time of the Ptolemies. Only during the 25th and 26th dynasty, the oldest period when something is known to us about the $\mathcal{S}p$, does it represent a real value: 2 deben of silver, that is to say about the purchase price of a slave at the time. Moreover, in this period many *artabas* of *boti* are always added. (Pestman 1961: 13- 14)\textsuperscript{58}

The question remains why Pharaoh gives Sarai much more than the normal $\mathcal{S}p$. One of the reasons could be the fact that he was king of Egypt, and that a king's $\mathcal{S}p$ used to be much greater than the $\mathcal{S}p$ of an inhabitant of the country. In the following, I try to show that there is no proof for an extra fine for the abduction of Sarai, and that the giving of the $\mathcal{S}p$ in this narrative reflects the practice from 230 B.C.E. onwards.\textsuperscript{59}

In this period (from 230 B.C.E. onwards) the $\mathcal{S}p$ $n$ $s.h$ $m.t$ was very often included in the $nkt.w$ $n$ $s.h$ $m.t$, i.e. "the things of a woman". "Things of a woman" is the description of:

private articles for use of the woman: vessels, ornaments, mirrors etc. ... These articles are brought into the marriage by the wife as her property. ... During marriage she remains the proprietress of them. ... the husband affirms that they have come into his house, and that he

---

\textsuperscript{57} See 1.3.4. The Date of 1QapGen: 26.

\textsuperscript{58} The 25th dynasty ended, and the 26th dynasty began in the year 655 B.C.E. This is long after the period in which Abram lived, i.e. the 19th century B.C.E. (Gispen 1975: 11 and 191).

*Artabas* of *boti* probably denotes a current measure of capacity (Pestman 1961: 14).

In my explanation of XX: 8b, I quote Grelot when he wonders how the name Horqonwash became known in an environment "si peu familiarisé avec les institutions égyptiennes qu'il place à Tanis (=So'an) la résidence du Pharaon au temps d'Abraham" (1971: 565). Here one gets the impression that the author at least knew much about Egyptian law in his own time. Hence, he must have had connections with Egypt. That could explain why he knew the name Horqonwash.
will give similar articles or their counter-value back to his wife in case of dissolution of the marriage. (Pestman 1961: 100-101)

Where the $sp$, gift, is included in the "things of a woman" it is possibly completely rendered to the woman in case of divorce. Pestman is not certain of this, since the amount of $sp$ given to the woman in case of divorce originally depended on who repudiates who. If it is the husband who initiated the divorce, he had to give her her $sp$ plus a fine equal to the value of the $sp$. If the wife initiated the divorce, she would only keep half of the $sp$. Whether this has changed when the $sp$ was included in the "things of a woman", which were completely the property of the woman, cannot be established by means of the sources available (Pestman 1961: 113-113). Thus, the value of the goods which a divorced woman got, depended on the value of her "things of a woman" and on who repudiated who.

The value of Sarai's "things of a woman" cannot be deduced from the Genesis Apocryphon, since there are no allusions to Abram's and Sarai's wealth before XX: 33. Moreover, the fact that Pharaoh sent off in haste for Sarai (XX: 8b-9) does not give the impression that Sarai had a chance to take much with her. Hence, her "things of a woman" would not be many. The matter of who repudiates who is very intricate, since this is an illegal marriage. The author suggests that Pharaoh has had Sarai abducted from her legal husband. Hence, Sarai has had no chance to protest against the marriage, or to repudiate it later. Therefore, I think that Sarai would receive the full $sp$. 
It is likely that an abductor was, at least, obliged to pay a fine. Whether Pharaoh also gave a fine or compensation, indicating his acknowledgement of a certain degree of liability, cannot be deduced from the text. In the narrative Pharaoh wisely did not specify the gifts.

- in Fitzmyer's reading cannot be found in the readings of AY, JLVD, and Beyer. It is merely a suggestion by Fitzmyer on how to read this text. Only the aleph and perhaps the first nun are discernable on CD-ROM.

32 introduces the direct object (Rosenthal 1983: 56, §182). The mentioning of Hagar is anticipatory: the origin of the Egyptian slave Hagar is made clear, since she plays an important role further in the Book of Genesis (Bernstein 1996: 44).

- Fitzmyer reads [ , to escort me [out of Egypt ] (1971: 66). My translation is more literal. (See also Muraoka 1972: 30). But Beyer reads: "die mich aus dem Lande Ägypten herausbringen sollten", (1984: 177). By reading this way Beyer fills up the lacuna. I cannot discern whether his version is better since the text is very blurred.

- Pharaoh wants to make sure that Abram leaves his territory; he appoints men to escort him. In that sense he is totally different from Moses' Pharaoh. The situation, of course, is also different. In Exodus the Hebrews are

---

60 Cassuto assumes that the Laws of Middle Assyria were also in force in Egypt. He writes: "Since the legal tradition in its general outline was common to all the countries of the 'Fertile Crescent', it may be assumed that the provisions of this clause were in force in all the countries of this region" (1974: 357).
slaves, and thus constitute an economic entity, whereas Abram and Sarai have only brought trouble, and no economical profit to Pharaoh.

Another explanation of the escort might be that Pharaoh wants to show that he cannot lay any legal claim to Sarai anymore, since she has left his area of jurisdiction. In Ptolemaic deeds the husband declares that he has no further rights towards his former wife. It is not known what these rights are which the husband has to his wife, but it is clear from what is stated in such a deed that the former wife is for instance, free to marry again (Pestman 1961: 72-73). In this case Pharaoh might want to express his sincerity that Sarai is free.

with very numerous flocks. Although Jastrow (1903: 911b) translates the word מַעֲשֶׂים with "[counted things,] account; property, business" I follow Fitzmyer, who argues that it can mean both "flocks" and "possessions, goods". Since silver and gold are independently listed in this context, מַעֲשֶׂים must mean "flocks". Where Abram had obtained them is not related. In XIX: 25 it is stated that Pharaoh's princes gave Abram numerous gifts, probably when they made his acquaintance in XIX: 24. But, whether cattle were part of the gifts, is unknown. It is more likely that Abram bred the herds during his seven year stay in Egypt, where there was no famine, for in XX: 34 it is also said of Lot, that he had acquired numerous flocks. Moreover, in XXII: 27-32 God says to Abram that ever since he left Haran, He increased all that Abram had, and that He will continue increasing his wealth and his flocks.

The silver and gold mentioned in this line could be the many gifts from Pharaoh's princes (XIX: 24-25), or money earned by cattle-breeding on the good grazing-fields in Egypt (see XIX: 10-12 and XX: 33-34). Since
column XVIII is missing, the *Genesis Apocryphon* does not supply us with the story about Abram's calling and his departure for Canaan as depicted in Gen. 12. There it is stated that Abram already had many possessions when they departed from Haran (Gen. 12: 5). Hence, it is possible that the author merely referred to the fact that Abram was rich, blessed by God, without reference to Egypt as the place of origin. The fact that the word שָׁלֹל occurs twice in connection with cattle, but not in connection with gold and silver is interesting. It indicates, that the silver and gold mentioned in XX: 33 could not be the silver and gold given to Sarai in XX: 31 because Sarai obtained [שָׁלֹל וּ[ט] נָא] after which she was returned to her husband, but in XX: 33 the quantity of silver and gold is reduced to שָׁלֹל נָא.

1QapGen XX: 32 suggests that Pharaoh immediately appointed men who would escort Abram and his family out of Egypt, with the result that there would not be time to exchange the silver and gold for cattle. This illustrates that Sarai's possessions were not included in Abram's.

- 1QapGen XX: 32 suggests that Pharaoh immediately appointed men who would escort Abram and his family out of Egypt, with the result that there would not be time to exchange the silver and gold for cattle. This illustrates that Sarai's possessions were not included in Abram's.

- JLVdW read [אָ協會 חָלִיךְ] "and Lot went" instead of Fitzmyer's [חָלִיךְ] "and Lot", or the suggestion he makes in his commentary (1971: 66-67 and 143). Just like Fitzmyer I can only be sure of the
letters outside the brackets. Consequently, I consider any addition to them conjecture. For the time being, I follow Fitzmyer's cautious conjecture. The reading of JLVdW makes a beautiful parallel with the beginning of XX: 33, אֲנָא אַבְרָהָם. It sketches a picture of Abram travelling with many flocks and other possessions, and Lot following his example.

"And he had taken for himself a wife from the daughters [of Egypt]". This is again an example of anticipatory writing. Here it is explained that Lot had a foreign wife, which makes it understandable, that she longed back to a pagan place such as Sodom, and was turned into a pillar of salt when she looked back (Gen. 19: 26). The fact that he chose an Egyptian wife might even suggest that Lot's choices in life as described further on in the Genesis Apocryphon, were not going to be in accordance with God's standards, and that a breach with Abram would eventually be unavoidable. In XXI: 5 the conduct of the shepherds is mentioned as the reason for the parting of Abram and Lot's ways, but on the ground of this passage one could also consider this an excuse for Lot to be able to go his own way, and make his own choices.

"for himself". Here the author makes use of the simple pronominal suffix in order to express a reflexive relationship (see Muraoka 1972: 10).

"And I [cam]ped over and over again". This reflects the meaning of פִּקֵד, since פִּקֵד with the participle commonly indicates continuous and habitual action (see Rosenthal 1983: 55).
Column XXI

1 Beyer (1984: 178) reads, "an der Stelle" where Fitzmyer reads םלצלожетמראת. Qimron correctly remarks that Beyer’s reading is probably the better one, since:

It is hard to tell whether the damaged letter is ayin or kaf, but obviously there is no space for another letter before it. Furthermore, the readingificaciones is inconsistent with the orthography of the scroll, since the word is generally spelled הבתי (except in 20. 6). (Qimron 1992: 17)

AY (1956: XXI) and JLVdW (1976: 102), however, agree with Fitzmyer’s version ([1971: 66). Since both versions relate that Abram went back on his steps (אהיהמתכלמל endTime ...מעל), the meaning of the versions is more or less the same.

- Fitzmyer (1971: 144) remarks correctly that this line "suggests that wherever Abram stopped on the journey back to Canaan, there Lot stopped too. This prepares for the eventual parting of the two of them."

- Lot travels with Abram till they reach Bethel. There Abram rebuilds the second altar he erected for God when he entered the Promised Land the first time. According to Genesis 12: 6-9 Abram built the first altar at Elon Moreh, and the second between Bethel and Ai. Fitzmyer (1971: 105), and Beyer (1984: 178) remark correctly that the story about the first altar must have been related before column XIX: 7.

-ificationalso occurs in XIX: 20. Sarai has to tell that Abram is her brother. However, those places are not the same places, since the narrator writes about places outside Egypt when he refers to יהוה in XXI: 1, whereas in XIX: 20 יהוה is in Egypt.
- I have translated "the place where I had built an altar", since Abram had built two altars according to Gen. 12: 7 and 8. This is in agreement with Vermes (1995: 296).

- The rebuilding of the altar has two meanings:

  a) Abram realises that he is dependent on God for his well-being. He acknowledges God's intervention. It is not by his own power that he has escaped death and terror in Egypt. And he wants to thank God, make visible his gratitude, and re-establish the worship of God in Canaan by rebuilding the altar. Hence, this rebuilding symbolises the rebuilding of his relationship with God.

  b) The rebuilding of the altar also has the following symbolic effect: Abram makes a new start. He travels back to the place where he last built an altar for God. From there he travelled southward to Hebron where he dwelt two years (XIX: 9-10) before he left for Egypt. Now he does away with this "after" period, and returns to the place where he has been grateful and happy, and close to God. That might also be the reason why Abram does not speak of a place "with Bethel on the west and Ai on the east" as it is called in Gen. 12: 8, but that he calls the place "Beth-El", House of God. (For further information on the name Bethel see Mack 1989: 122).

- Bethel is the site of the famous ancient sanctuary on the road from Jerusalem to Shechem, where Abram first called on the name of the Lord (Gen. 12: 8; 13: 4). Its more ancient name was Luz, where God revealed himself to Jacob, and where Deborah was buried. Jacob associates the place with God's blessing of fertility and land (Gen. 28: 19; 35: 6; 48: 3; Judg. 1: 23). In Gen. 12: 8 the place of the altar is described more precisely:
And he pulled up his stakes from there for the high country east of Bethel and pitched his tent with Bethel to the west and Ai to the east, and he built there an altar to the LORD, and he invoked the name of the LORD.

Although there are many lacunae in column XIX, there are striking resemblances between XXI: 1 and XIX: 7, 9. By showing a very similar situation, the author indicates that Abram starts anew. I have underlined the words in question of column XXI, line 1:

1: XXI
לא אסף משירא אנה ו?url שלם אלי
I have underlined the words in question of column XXI, line 1:

7: XIX
םנשכ תק"מ מוחה [א] [ג] [ג] [ג]
The words occur in XIX: 9 and XXI: 1; in XIX: 7 and XXI: 1; and מברא occurs in XIX: 7 and XXI: 1. Thus, the author himself refers to the original situation when he writes about "the place where I had built an altar". By adding דנה תאה אל he emphasises the rebuilding of it.
Column XIX: 7 says: [פַּדְגָּו תַּבְּשָׁא גִּלְעָד], whereas XXI: 2 reads: [פַּדְגָּו תַּבְּשָׁא]. Abram calls God אָלֶם at first, but after his Egyptian adventure he calls Him the Lord of the Ages, but also אלָל, God Most High. This indicates that Abram has learnt to know God better.

A similar conclusion concerning passages in the Genesis Apocryphon can be drawn in connection with Noah who calls God "the eternal King for ever and ever and ever" when he landed on one of the mountains of Ararat (X: 10-12; the italics are mine to emphasise the similarity with XXI: 2), and "the Lord of Heaven" (XI: 12-13), or "the Master of the Heavens" (XI: 15) when God had made the land dry (see MQS 1995: 44-47). In XII: 17
Noah "blessed the Lord of Heaven, *the Most High God*, the Great Holy One who delivered us from destruction" (GQ 1992: 72-73; again, the italics are mine to emphasise the similarity with 1QapGen XXI: 2). It is remarkable that Noah, who has experienced a continuous rainfall which resulted in the Great Flood, calls God the Lord and Master of the *Heavens*. My conclusion is based on these grounds; that the contents of a prayer to God show what the protagonist has learnt about God.⁶¹

Whereas AY, Fitzmyer, and JLVDW read an _af el_ of נָבָא, which is a causative form, Beyer (1984: 178) reads a _pa el_ (נָבָא), which is a factitive/causative form (1984: 465). I think that Beyer's version is right, since there is no space on the scroll for נ in Fitzmyer's נָבָא. However, this does not have influence upon the meaning of the text (1984: 468).

Lot was still with him during the sacrifices, but from XXI: 5 it is clear that he leaves Abram after that day, as it is stated, due to the conduct of their shepherds.

The narrator tells us that Abram offers many sacrifices to God: holocausts and a sacrificial offering (תֵּלָתָא רְשִׁית (תֵּלָתָא רְשִׁית)), and praises and blesses Him. The plurality of the sacrifices and the duplication of the fact that Abram praises (and blesses) runs parallel with XX: 12: "That night I prayed, and I entreated, and I asked for mercy, and I said in sorrow as my tears ran down" The author suggests that now that God has answered his four-fold prayer, Abram shows his gratitude four-fold.

⁶¹ I call Abram a protagonist, since he is the acting character in the narrative. God, who is in fact the main character, does not come in the limelight, but keeps a low profile. In some instances Abram functions as God's instrument. Consequently, Abram acts as God's proxy, e.g. Abram's imposition of hands for Pharaoh's healing.
Jastrow (1903: 799a) and Fitzmyer (1971: 144) describe הַעֲשֵׂה as a meal-offering.

3 This word occurs in XIX: 5 in connection with the princes visiting Abram. They ask הָעֲשֵׂה from him (Jastrow 515b, הָעֲשֵׂה II: “1. good, precious... 2. worth, valued.”). In XXI: 3 the word occurs in connection with God. He is the One who has given הָעֲשֵׂה to Abram. הָעֲשֵׂה is probably associated with God and people serving Him. In XIX: 25 it was translated with "kindness", since that is probably all that a man fleeing from the famine would be able to give. In XXI: 3 it was translated with "good things", for it stands in connection with flocks, material things, given to Abram, whereas further on it is stated that God had also done good to Abram. A concordant translation is impossible.

This sentence reminds of XX: 13, where Abram describes God's power, הָעֲשֵׂה, and XX: 14 where he begs Him to mete out justice to Pharaoh for himself, הָעֲשֵׂה. However, in XXI: 3 Abram acknowledges that God has not only meted out justice to Pharaoh for his sake, but that He has also done good to him in several ways: He has given him wealth and another chance in the Promised Land. This last fact, that Abram thanks God that "He had brought me back to this land in safety" (XXI: 3-4), is striking, since Canaan was the land of the famine, and the adventure started due to the fact that he wanted to flee starvation. This pericope indicates that Abram's yielding to natural needs has been transformed into a transcendental belief in God (Gitay 1996: 212 and 216). Furthermore, the Promised Land is the land promised to his descendants (XXI: 9-14). That means that he will not only have a place to settle down, but also, that he will have children to carry on his line. With God there is
G' After the facts have become clear, Pharaoh asks Abram why he has said "She's my sister", although she was his wife (XX: 22-28)
F' Abram prays for Pharaoh and he lives (XX: 28-29)
E' Pharaoh makes known and swears that he has not known Sarai, and he returns her to Abram (XX: 29-31)
D' Pharaoh gives gifts to Sarai (XX: 31-32)
C' Escort out of Egypt (XX: 32-34)
B' Journey to Bethel (XX: 34-XXI:1)
A' Abram rebuilds the altar and sacrifices; there he invokes God's name; praises, blesses, and thanks God (XXI:1-4)

The story is a self-contained entity in a circular form, beginning and ending with the same event: Abram building an altar for God near Bethel, where he brings sacrifices to Him. However, a closer look at the two events indicated by means of A and A' shows that Abram is extremely happy and relieved in A', whereas his attitude is more sober in A. The reason for this difference can be found in Abram's Egyptian adventure related in the pericope.

B relates the journey through the Promised Land. Abram is journeying towards the South, and settles in Hebron where he lives for two years until a famine occurs. Abram learns that there is grain in Egypt, and decides to exchange the Promised Land for Egypt. In B' Abram returns to Canaan via the same route as the one of his journey towards Egypt.

In C Abram travels to the Land of the Sons of Ham (XIX:13), where there is plenty of water. During the first night in Egypt, Abram has a dream about two trees belonging to one family, who have to stand together to survive, that fills him with fear. Abram explains this dream to his wife Sarai, and asks her to cooperate
refuge in silence in I, whereas the Egyptians flee the prevailing spirit in I'.
The centre of the story (J/J') is one of action and contra-action. God intervenes
by means of a pestilential spirit. The Egyptians called in to heal Pharaoh and his
house, and not knowing which Power they are fighting against, are overcome by
It when they are in Pharaoh's house. They flee in panic, for the Power prevails
over them. This event forms the pivot of the narrative. God reveals Himself
exactly as Abram has described Him in XX: 12-16. Moreover, He reveals that He
is faithful to His plan with Abram, and does not allow humans to disturb it. What
 Abram prays in XX: 15, i.e. "...that it may be known about you, my Lord, that you
 are the Lord of all the kings of the earth!", comes true when Pharaoh, Horqonwash, all the wise men of Egypt, all the enchanters, and all the physicians
of Egypt acknowledge His power and justice. This is important, for Pharaoh and
his house are presented as the co-workers of Satan. They do not know God, and
do not want to acknowledge Him, but in the end they cannot resist His power. The
author presents them as immoral beings in accordance with the Egyptians in the
Exodus narrative, in order to shift the emphasis away from Abram's indecent
attitude towards Sarai. The fact that God plays a pivotal role in this pericope leads
to the conclusion that He is the main character of the narrative, even though He
does not act in the foreground.
Abram's prayer in A' reflects his acknowledgement and his gratitude towards God
whom he has come to know better by this adventure.

3.7. Analysis of the Narrative

The remnants of column XIX begin with Abram building an altar on which he

---

62 This analysis is greatly indebted to Fokkelman's system as described in his book
sacrifices. The author of the *Genesis Apocryphon* emphasises the place where Abram sacrifices by the repetition of the word פֶּן in XIX: 7. With פֶּן the author means either the Promised Land, or Bethel, as can be derived from column XXI: 1. He emphasises the place of Abram's stay in anticipation of the fact that this situation would come to an end.

After a prayer Abram decides to continue his journey to the holy mountain and eventually to Hebron. Now a contrast between Abram and the people of the land can be seen. Whereas the people of the land build the city of Hebron, Abram merely dwells there for two years. He does not intend to settle there, for the whole land shall be his. Instead, he has built an altar for God, indicating that he relies on God for his well-being. In contrast, the city-builders seek refuge in a stronghold, reminding the audience of the narrative about Babel, where the builders were doomed to fail, for they relied upon their own power, and had forgotten about God. The fact that Abram lives amongst such people augurs nothing good.

Then a famine breaks out. This is a decisive moment. Now Abram's relationship with God is put to the test. The author, who writes in the first person singular, as if he is Abram telling this story, writes that the whole land was affected by the famine. On the other hand, he heard that there was grain in Egypt, with the result that he went there. The author presents this in a very innocent way, as if this was

---

*Vertelkunst in de Bijbel* (1997)

It is likely that the audience knew *Genesis*. However, this story could also be known from 1QapGen. According to Morgenstem a number of 70 to 105 columns of text are missing before column I of 1QapGen. He bases this statement on the occurrence of Hebrew numbers in the top right-hand corner of the last three sheets (1996: 345-347). Therefore, it is to be expected that 1QapGen contained a re-writing of all the material of *Genesis* before the Abraham narrative, which would include *Genesis* 11. However, this remains conjecture.

The sentences יָאָהָּ֥א כָּם מַרְאָּהָּ֥אָּא וְאַל כָּמַּא הַמַּמָאָּשָּּא וְאַל מַרְאָּּאָּ בְּעָּמָּאָּ in XIX: 10 form an
the logical continuation of the journey through Canaan. It seems as if he has completely forgotten God and His promise. The passage "and it came to pass" in XIX: 11 indicates the crossing of the border between the Promised Land and Egypt. Immediately the scene changes. The arid, dusty Land of the Promise contrasts greatly with the abundance of water in Egypt. If the reconstruction of XIX: 12 is correct, "our land" is mentioned twice in connection with the crossing of the border (in XIX: 12 and 13). Three parallelisms in XIX: 13 emphasise the move from one country to the other:

The ס- suffixes in the first and second line in the above suggest cohesion, whereas the transition to לאוהוב בני היה לאוהוב ממנה suggests a breach, not only in sound and metre, but also, in reality, with the Promised Land. Hence, "our land" is turned down; it is a place of death. Egypt is the land where Abram wants to be.

Nonetheless, the audience feels uneasy about this move, due to the fact that "our land" is mentioned twice, and due to the contrast "the land of the sons of Ham". Abram turns down what is supposed to be his, and prefers to live in a land which is not destined for him. Thus, the author creates a sequence, which permeates the narrative.

Whereas יַּעְבֹד, "to cross", is very important in the second paragraph, יָכֹוש, "to dream", is central in the third. This change involves not only a crossing from one country to another, but also from the real world to the realm of dreams.\(^{65}\)
Abram's dream begins with אֶלֶת, "and look", which indicates a visual symbolic dream. This dream is inserted in the text to elucidate to the reader what will happen in the narrative. The text is rather enigmatic, as dreams are supposed to be, but it is clear that Abram dreams about two trees, which consider themselves relatives. The beautiful tree66, a date- palm, is left alone, whereas some men intend to hew down the other tree, a cedar. By the author's reference to a tree bearing fruit and a tall tree, the audience realises immediately that this dream is about Sarai (the palm- tree) and Abram (the cedar). Of course, the audience knows the story about Sarai's abduction in the biblical parallel; consequently they know that her beauty is the reason for her abduction. However, the author tells a slightly different story; the men want to uproot the cedar, i.e. to kill Abram! The sequence rises. It is understandable that the author writes that the date- palm is to be left by itself (XIX: 15) for by writing in the first person singular he presents Abram's side of the story. What will happen to Sarai is not his first worry. Moreover, the audience knows what will happen to her according to Genesis 12.

Now the dream takes an interesting turn. The date- palm shouts: "Do not cut down the cedar for we are both from one family". The shouting indicates a sudden reaction (see Appendix C), which leads to the salvation of the cedar. The paragraph is concluded by the parallelism: בִּשְׁמֹא וּבִקְרָאתָ הַצָּבָא הַגָּזָה הָאָבִּי. The fact that the cedar is spared gives hope, but the dream does not tell what more is in store for Abram and Sarai in this foreign country.

In the next paragraph (XIX: 17- 23) Abram tells Sarai that he has dreamt, and that he is afraid. נַפְּדָעָה מאֶלֶת forms a chiasmus with מַעֵדְנָה, and therefore attracts

66 The word "beautiful" is conjecture. See XIX: 15 above.
attention. Similar to the forms of כוֹזָר, כָּזָר^8 also contains the consonants כ and ז, but כז^8 immediately catches the eye (and ear), due to the כ and the oo-sound. Consequently, it emphasises Abram's fear.

Sarai reacts as any good wife would; she tries to calm Abram down by asking him to share the dream with her. This is important, for it is a visual symbolic dream. Such dreams are enigmatic, and a second dream is usually required to decode them, or advice from someone else, "frequently women" (Gnuse 1996: 45). Therefore, it is to be expected that Sarai will explain the dream. In contrast to this convention, Abram interprets it himself. It can be argued that this indicates that he is a special man, with great wisdom. However, since Abram is in a fearful state, but especially since there is a convention that someone else has to explain a visual symbolic dream, it is doubtful whether Abram was able to give the right pesher. It is likely that Sarai would at least have given a different application of the dream, in which she would not suffer, just like the date-palm in the dream. The author does not repeat the dream, which the audience already knows. Neither does he explain the dream in detail as was customary at the time.6 The compelling passage "who will seek to kill me and leave you alone" occurs immediately after a lacuna, which does not supply enough space in order to both identify the symbols and tell which symbol stands for what. He might have had good reasons to break with the normal pattern in this situation. This might suggest the seriousness of the dream, and the shock it caused. Abram went to Egypt to flee the famine (XIX: 10-11), but now his life was still in danger! Hence, the author indicates the fear, which Abram confesses to have in XIX: 18, and the importance of solving the problem. This way of writing also adds to the liveliness of the story.

---

6 See Appendix C.
On the other hand, it makes the audience feel ill at ease, because something is strange about the narrative. It seems as if the author, while writing in the first person singular and thus presuming to be Abram, tries to obscure Abram's egocentric behaviour.

The passage יָהָלַעְתִי וָאֹתָו נָעָנָה in XIX: 19 is an antithetic chiasmus, indicating Abram and Sarai's strong tie as members of one family: a tie which may not be broken. This forms the introduction to Abram's plea for help. In this way, the atmosphere is made right to ask the favour, which will lead to Sarai's suffering, as the audience knows from the Genesis account. The pun in XIX: 20, יִלְכְּדָה וָאֹתָו נָעָנָה, reveals how Abram associated the one קָנַה with the other: יִלְכְּדָה. I shall live, יִלְכְּדָה, if Sarai says "He's my brother", יִלְכְּדָה. It is significant that Abram says that his soul will be spared because of Sarai, for it is exactly Sarai's soul which will suffer by the denial of her marriage to Abram; she will suffer loneliness, abduction and alienation in Egypt, but worst of all, Abram's rejection. That Abram is presented as very egocentric can be derived from the fact that he mentions his own fate first in XIX: 19. If Sarai were as selfish as Abram, the words יִלְכְּדָה וָאֹתָו נָעָנָה, "and leave you alone" in XIX: 19 might lead to her decision not to co-operate. In order to emphasise that Sarai must co-operate, Abram repeats יָהָלַעְתִי וָאֹתָו נָעָנָה in XIX: 21. This forms part of the antithetic chiasmus יָהָלַעְתִי וָאֹתָו נָעָנָה, יָהָלַעְתִי וָאֹתָו נָעָנָה, which forms an interpretation of the passage in XIX: 19. Abram uses another meaning of יָהָלַעְתִי, viz. "to bequeath"! If Sarai wants to resist co-operation with Abram she will be bequeathed. In its turn, the antithetic chiasmus in XIX: 21 forms an antithetic chiasmus with יָהָלַעְתִי וָאֹתָו נָעָנָה in XIX: 19. Thus, the author encloses Abram's plea to his wife. Sarai is trapped.

68 For reasons such as concordancy and suspense I keep the translation "leave (alone)" in XIX: 19.
No wonder that she cries, and no wonder that she does not want to continue the journey! The author closes the paragraph with an illustration of the suffering of her soul, when she is afraid in her soul to be seen.

The dream did not predict such a situation. According to the dream the palm-tree shouted that she and the cedar belonged to the same family, which saved the life of the cedar (XIX: 16-17). Since the author mentions in the next verse that Abram awoke, it seems that XIX: 17 was the end of the dream. This suggests that there were no problems afterwards. The only conclusion which can be derived is that Abram's pesher is faulty. This has serious consequences for how the audience perceives of Abram. Dreams are supposed to be divine revelations. Hence, if a dream tells people to tell a lie, they are not to blame, because they do what the godhead ordered them to do. However, God never revealed to Abram that he should tell a lie. The lie was the result of Abram's eisegesis. This makes the audience also wonder about Abram's interpretation of the word נַפּוֹל; is Abram as innocent as he is presented?

The next paragraph (XIX: 23-?) seems to indicate, that Abram and Sarai indeed did not have to fear the Egyptians; they live in Egypt for five years, without any problems, as far as can be deduced from the damaged text. Then three of Pharaoh's princes come "concerning [my] words and my wife" (XIX: 24). "Concerning [my] words" seems to refer to Abram's wisdom (XIX: 25), whereas the word "wife" makes the audience alert, but soon they are at ease again, for the situation is very peaceful: the princes bring presents, and Abram teaches them wisdom. It seems that on that occasion they have a nice party with much eating and much drinking (XIX: 27). Abram is clearly in Egypt, the land of abundance: the word נַפּוֹל occurs three times in what is left of this section (once in XIX: 25, and
twice in XIX: 27 if Fitzmyer's restoration is correct).

However, this paragraph, beginning at the end of XIX: 23, is written to hoodwink the audience. Indeed, it seems as if the princes are very friendly. Moreover, it seems as if Abram is very naive by organising a plentiful dinner during which he shows off with his wisdom, which ironically appears to be the wisdom of Enoch in XIX: 25, but again there is something strange in the story. Why do the Egyptian princes appear only after five years? According to XIX: 24 they came "concerning [my] words and my wife". Hence, those words do not refer to Abram's wisdom, but to the fact that Abram himself had spoken to them! When the Egyptians stayed away, he made contact with them in order to enforce the fulfilment of his interpretation!

Unfortunately, the rest of the text is missing, but it is clear that the three princes make acquaintance with Sarai. For the next column starts with a description of her to Pharaoh, who decides to kidnap Sarai. The expected, which the audience has been fearing all the time, happens.

The following paragraph begins at XIX: 32, where a vacat is visible in a further unreadable part of the scroll. Hence, it is to be guessed what has happened in the lost lines. The three Egyptian princes have probably met Sarai, for XX: 8 relates that it is three people who praise her. When this encounter between Pharaoh and the princes takes place, cannot be deduced from the text.

Sarai's beauty is described poetically in 1QapGen XX: 2- 8 (see 3.5. Text-critical and Philological Notes, Column XX: 130- 131). In column XX: 6c the style changes; it is the preamble to the climax in XX: 7- 8a. In this preamble Sarai is compared to other women, whose beauty she exceeds by far. Moreover, she has much wisdom.
The first readable sentences of column XX till XX: 6b form an anaphora, beginning with כְָּבָּשׁ, כְָּבָּשׁ. The description of her beauty runs from head to toes in XX: 2-6b, which is in accordance with the classical Near Eastern tradition. To render this song in accord with the Hellenistic song of praise, the praise of feminine wisdom (skill) is added (Cohen 1981: 44 and 50: 3.5. Text-critical and Philological Notes, Column XX: 131). However, this is not only a matter of Hellenisation of a genre; it has consequences for the explanation of the pericope. The Egyptian princes acknowledge Sarai's wisdom, in contrast to Abram in XIX: 18! This is food for thought in connection with the interpretation of XIX: 21, where Sarai weeps at Abram's words. She might have realised that both the dream and its pesher came from Abram, but that she lacked the power to make him change his plan. She was rejected.

The word כְָּבָּשׁ (כְָּבָּשׁ) appears in the whole description of Sarai's beauty. However, at the beginning the author uses it to describe "all the radiance of her face" (XX 3, 4), "all her whiteness" (XX: 4), "all the appearance of her hands" (XX: 5), "all the fingers of her hands" (XX: 5). Yet from XX: 6 on, כְָּבָּשׁ (כְָּבָּשׁ) is used to compare her with all other women, whose beauty she surpasses.

The author uses forms of נַעֲמָל 9 times in this section, of which 4 occur in the climax in XX: 7. The fact that Sarai has much wisdom just adds to the climax. In the anaphora the word נַעֲמָל occurs 7 times. However, as soon as the preamble to the climax begins, this particle disappears. By doing so the author implies that Sarai is no longer the person to whom the beauty belongs. He suggests thereby that this beauty could belong to Pharaoh! Horqönwash' s speech takes a cunning turn.
After the extensive and suggestive description of Sarai's beauty in the previous paragraph, Pharaoh cannot but aspire to have this woman for himself. This is illustrated by the haste with which he sends his servants to bring her (XX: 9). The shift from the time-consum ing praise of Sarai to the five actions in only one line (XX: 9) expresses his greed. This greed is enforced by Sarai's beauty, which exceeds his imagination. It also leads to his plan to kill Abram, after he has taken her as a wife. It is interesting that the author first indicates the process of the development of the greed (beheld, marvelled, took), after which the climax indicates his readiness to kill Abram. The function of this climax is to point out that Abram's prediction is being fulfilled. The audience is not astonished; this is the kind of Pharaoh they know from the Exodus narrative.

Fortunately, Sarai saves her husband by saying that Abram is her brother\textsuperscript{69}, which is exactly in accord with his plea in XIX: 20. הָאֵשׁ is a conflation of הָאֵשׁ כְּ. It suggests the haste with which Sarai said it to Pharaoh. She did not even allow the narrator to finish the word כְּ properly!

However, again the author makes his audience feel uneasy, for Sarai spoke these words when Abram "was negotiating about what concerned her" (XX: 10). Certainly, there would not be a chance to negotiate if Abram told Pharaoh that she was his wife! Hence, Abram's negotiations were of such a kind, that they forced her to say that he was her brother! Hence, in XIX: 17-18 Abram tells a dream which he has invented himself; in XIX: 19-21 Abram produces his faulty pesher; in XIX: 23-? Abram induces the princes to come and see Sarai; and in XIX: 21

\textsuperscript{69} There is a dispute amongst scholars as to the reliability of what is written in Gen. 20: 12, i.e. that they are paternal brother and sister. This dispute is not important for this research, since what matters is only that in the Genesis Apocryphon aspects of Gen. 20 are intermingled with aspects from Gen. 12, the story about Sarai and Abram 's stay in Egypt. Since Gen. 20 states that they have the same father, I accept that in this synchronic analysis.
and XX: 10 Abram forces his wife to pass him off for her brother. Surely, Abram has a great share in the course of the plot! And the author, writing in the first person singular (on behalf of Abram), does everything to obscure this. In this paragraph he obscures it by placing Abram's negotiations after Sarai's saving words, thus suggesting that it was Sarai who spoke before Abram started the negotiations.

Now the formulation of the passage "had her brought to him" in XX: 9 draws attention, for in XX: 11 and 14 Abram claims that Sarai has been abducted. However, the wording in XX: 9 does not refer to a kidnapping. It could be a totally decent way of obtaining Sarai. The fact that Abram is negotiating with Pharaoh also indicates that there was no abduction. The author is busy whitewashing Abram's reputation!

The parallelism in XX: 10 forms a chiastic structure: "crying and weeping" in XX: 10 sounds similar, and can thus be considered a pun, emphasizing Sarai's fate. She is Abram's victim. The tears he sheds in XX: 10-11 are crocodile tears. He has done everything to make his pesher come true.

In order to make the audience feel sorry for Abram, the author depicts a situation where Abram and his nephew are crying bitterly. Abram has lost his beloved wife, and the orphan Lot has lost his stepmother. The author describes a family suffering a great loss. He also emphasizes Abram's crying. In XX: 10-11 Abram weeps bitterly, and in XX: 16 it is said that he weeps again, after his prayer to God. The author depicts Abram as someone who is tormented by a forceful act by the ruler of Egypt. With the Exodus narrative in mind the audience would
probably think: what else can be expected from Pharaoh? Hence, the author again
tries to hoodwink the audience.

Abram weeps, and Lot is in solidarity with him. This stands in glaring contrast to
XIX: 21, where Sarai weeps all by herself. This emphasises Sarai’s loneliness. Not
only when she hid herself in order to prevent problems, but also when she was
introduced into Pharaoh’s house, staying in Egypt had loneliness in store for her.
She was powerless, a victim of circumstances for which she did not bear any
responsibility, for it was her husband, who had decided to travel to Egypt (XIX:
10), who said that he had dreamt (XIX: 17), who made contact with the
princes (XIX: 22-27), and who forced her to pass him off as her brother.
Unfortunately, the column before column XIX is missing, with the result that it is
not known whether there is any allusion to Sarai’s barrenness in the Genesis
Apocryphon. However, it would not be surprising if this pericope reveals how
Abram wanted to get rid of his infertile wife.

Another striking factor when one compares XX: 11 with XX: 14 is the word-
order when there is talk of Sarai taken away by force. Line 11 reads:
ראה התיאוריה, whereas line 14 has: ראה התיאוריה. In both
instances the word-order is normal, and BL indicate that the phenomenon of
chiasmus is nothing special, since it occurs often in the Aramaic of the biblical
book of Daniel without any implications (e.g. in Dan. 5: 1, see BL 1962: 342-
345). However, there are differences between the two passages if due attention
is paid to the word which follows immediately after a form of נִבְרָה, and if the
place of "by force" is taken in consideration. Then it can be seen that in XX: 11
the author stresses the fact that Sarai was taken away "from me" by force, which
suggests that Abram is sad because he misses Sarai. On the other hand, 1QapGen
XX: 14 emphasises the fact that Pharaoh has taken "my wife" away "from me" by
force, indicating Abram's complaint against Pharaoh. Hence, in both instances the word-order is very functional. Furthermore, if the attention is focused on "by force", the reader will notice that in XX: 11 Sarai is the victim of a forceful deed, whereas in XX: 14 Abram lodges a complaint on behalf of a forceful act committed against himself. Hence, in XX: 11 the author tries to obtain the sympathy of the audience, whereas he makes Abram sound very formal and honest, his words betray his egocentrism, in his prayer to the omniscient God. When attention is paid to the place of Sarai in both sentences, it is clear, that in XX: 11 she features between two evils: Abram and force; whereas in XX: 14 she occurs nameless between "he has taken" and "from me"(i.e. Abram). Sarai was to be taken by Pharaoh!

The next paragraph (XX: 12- 16) begins with a determination of time: that night. In one day, Pharaoh's princes praised Sarai, with the result that Pharaoh took her as wife, and wanted to kill Abram, but Sarai saved Abram with the story that Abram was her brother, and in that same day Abram cried bitterly. Now, in the night of the very same day when Sarai was taken away from him, Abram sends up his prayer to God. This is indeed an eventful day in contrast to the five years of rest.

Abram's prayer, of course, reflects the events of the day, and deals with his fear that he would definitely loose his wife (XX: 15). The author presents him praying very dramatically "in sorrow as my tears ran down" (XX: 12), that God might help him out of this trouble.

There is a strange formulation in XX: 12. Abram prays, and entreats, and asks for mercy. The reader wonders why the author emphasises Abram's humility, and why the three descriptions of prayer end up in a climax indicating guilt. So far, the
author has tried to indicate by means of the dream, that Abram was not to blame for the device, but here a very overt recognition of guilt can be found: a plea for mercy! It seems as if Abram realises that Sarai's abduction is meant as a punishment. But for what? It is not to be expected that the author suddenly changed his mind, and that he acknowledges Abram's great role in the course of the narrative. Moreover, it is especially Sarai who suffers by the abduction, not Abram.

The determination of time gives an indication of the reason for this request for mercy. First of all, night-time is the time when work is done, and when people have time to reflect on the things of the day. That is what Abram also does, and he does it in prayer. This is an interesting phenomenon, for during the five years of XIX: 23 God plays no role whatsoever in Abram's life. It seems as if the dream was the last contact between God and Abram. But now that Abram is in trouble, he cannot help thinking of God, and he realises the mistakes he has made: by abandoning the Promised Land and by forgetting God he has erred away from God. In Canaan he has brought his last sacrifice to God, which symbolises the trust that the God, who was with him in Ur and Haran, is also powerful in this new environment. However, in Egypt he has forgotten God, probably because the Promised Land was so disappointing during the famine, and he merely focussed on his own survival. This might also have been the reason why he told that he had dreamt, and why he forced the realisation of his pesher, when nothing happened during five years. He might have wanted to get rid of Sarai, who remained as barren as the Promised Land, in contrast to the luxuriant country of Egypt. Abram did not only want to survive physically, but also in terms of descendants, and Sarai stood in his way. What is the use of a beautiful woman who cannot bear children?!
But now that Sarai is gone, Abram realises that she has been faithful to him all the time. When he wanted to remain in Egypt, she stayed with him although she was very scared. When he received the princes, she provided for the food. When he negotiated about her with Pharaoh, she saved his life by saying that he was her brother. Nonetheless, he has made an agreement with Pharaoh, with the result that he has lost Sarai. This is what Abram would like us to think, but the reality might be different. Above, the orphan Lot appeared crying in solidarity with Abram. Lot's crying was not emphasised, whereas Abram's was. This indicates that Lot's crying was of a different order: he cried for the loss of his stepmother. After the hardship of losing his parents, this was another moment of great insecurity in his life. It is likely that he would blame Abram for his negotiations with Pharaoh, with the result that their relationship deteriorated. Hence, Abram is not "left alone" in the sense of XX: 10, but he is alone as a result of betraying Sarai. However, the author also shows that Abram realises that there is still a chance to change the situation. God had given him the dream in Egypt. This means that He has power in Egypt, too. Therefore, he prays and entreats and asks for mercy. Abram's prayer is very formal. First he blesses God, and says:"God Most High, my Lord, for all ages!" It is striking that Abram uses these words, for they hark back to אלהים אלהים in XIX: 8. He probably wants to show that he is still the same person as the one who sacrificed to God in the Promised Land, and he reminds God of their relationship, while neglecting the five years without communication. In order to enhance his argumentation, he acknowledges God's greatness, and indicates his intention to remain faithful. The function of these words is to convince God to help him.

---

70 See Lot's attitude in XX: 22- 23.
In XX:15 Abram prays that Pharaoh will not have power to defile his wife. Sarai would be defiled by Pharaoh, if he had sexual intercourse with her, expressed by the word "to know" (יָדַע) in Aramaic. In XX: 15-16 Abram prefers another kind of "knowledge", i.e. "...that it may be known (זָכַר לְךָ) about you, my Lord, that you are the Lord of all the kings of the earth!" This is a pun.

The author presents Abram as someone flattering God, but Abram's flattering is realistic; he describes God as He is. He describes how powerful God is; He can mete out justice even to kings. Thereafter, he lodges his complaint with God against the Pharaoh Zaan, the king of Egypt. Note, that the formulation is very similar to an official complaint (see Greenfield 1980: XXXIV). He lodges the complaint with God, who is addressed as "my Lord". The name of the accused is spelled out precisely, so that no misunderstanding might occur. The accused is charged with the abduction of Abram's wife, which took place by force. The plaintiff is thus accusing Pharaoh of a violent deed (i.e. abduction) against both him and his wife. In XX: 14 the plaintiff institutes proceedings: "Mete out justice to him for me... against him and against all his house. May he not have power to defile my wife from me tonight" The end of the indictment has the character of a prayer again: "that it may be known about you, my Lord, that you are the Lord of all the kings of the earth", herewith acknowledging God's power, and trying to convince God that He must stand in the breach for him. "Show forth your great hand" in XX: 14 functions in very much the same way; it refers to XX: 13, and at the same time seeks to convince God to help Abram. His weeping emphasises his need for help.

It is significant that Abram accuses Pharaoh only of the abduction of his wife. He makes no mention of Pharaoh's attempt to kill him (XX: 9), with the result that he had to act as if Sarai was his sister, and negotiate concerning her. This makes
the audience feel uneasy. Abram has acted differently from what was suggested in the dream, and he does not even mention, nor defend it! In this way the narrator suggests that what was said to the audience, viz. that Pharaoh wanted to kill Abram, was not true. It was a lie in order to whitewash his reputation! God, who is omniscient, could not be fooled; ergo Abram did not use that argument in his prayer. As a result, my structural analysis\textsuperscript{71}, indicating a relationship between Pharaoh's and Abram's behaviour, must be seen in a different light. The author has the intention to present Abram as better than he really is. He must do so, for he has chosen to write in the first person singular. Certainly, Abram would not acknowledge the role he has played in reality! He would present himself more advantageously. And this is what the narrator accordingly does. Hence, Pharaoh is not only presented as Abram's antagonist, but Pharaoh's behaviour is also rendered opposite to Abram's. The author presents Abram as the man seeking to walk with God, whereas Pharaoh is the man walking with the opposer, Satan. This tendency to emphasise Pharaoh's negative traits, and to absolve Abram of the defects in the biblical version, is derived from the genre of the aggadic midrash (Mack 1989: 129, see Appendix D).

When Abram institutes proceedings, he makes a very important remark. He says, "mete out justice for me". Here Abram shows, in a practical manner, his faith in God; that He is the ultimate Judge, and through Him justice exists. This reminds the audience of Cain's sin, as represented in the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan (ס"ז) on Gen. 4: 8 where Cain says to his brother Abel: לֵֽלָּה דִּי הָאָלָּֽהָּ דִּיְי in reaction to his dispute with Abel about God's rejection of his sacrifice. The author of the Genesis Apocryphon depicts Abram, as someone standing in a

\textsuperscript{71} F) Pharaoh seeks to kill Abram (20: 9); F' Abram prays for Pharaoh and he lived (20:
glaring contrast to Cain. He trusts the Lord, whatever God may think of him. This might be the best way to convince Him.

Moreover, at the end of the prayer Abram has another strong argument to convince God; he sees some sense in what is happening, in contradiction to Cain in Pseudo- Jonathan. He realises that this is an opportunity to show the kings of the world, that ultimately it is God who is in command, and that they cannot but obey: "that it may be known about you, my Lord, that you are the Lord of all the kings of the earth!" (XX: 15-16). Hence, Abram offers himself as an instrument to God. It must be clear to the audience, that only by his God Abram can leap over a wall, as it is written in 2 Sam.22: 30 and Ps.18: 30.

When Abram has stated his case, he weeps in sorrow, and remains silent. Abram weeps during and after his prayer (see XX: 12 and 16). The author describes Abram this way to indicate his distress and to make the audience feel sorry for him. It is to be doubted whether the omniscient God would be impressed by it.

Whether Abram’s weeping causes some relief, cannot be ascertained, but now that Abram has lodged his complaint, all he can do is to await the Judge’s decree. His silence afterwards could indicate exhaustion. It was an eventful day, and it must have been difficult to pray under these circumstances. Note that there is no reference to sleep that night!

In my analysis of the structure of the pericope I made a distinction between XX: 16-18 "God in action", and XX: 18-21 "The Egyptian healers in contra- action". Those lines form one paragraph, and constitute the pivot of the narrative. The Egyptian healers, of course, are the losers. They flee and leave Pharaoh powerless in his palace.  

28-29).
The author depicts God's immediate action during the night of that very same day. It seems as if God has been waiting for Abram's plea, and that He was happy to be asked to interfere. He creates a situation in which Pharaoh is unable to defile Sarai for two years. In this way, Sarai's safety is consolidated. It seems as if God is especially worried about her situation, for He does not do anything special for Abram. Nonetheless, the impotence in Pharaoh's house for two years is more than Abram has asked, because Abram asked for a solution for "tonight" only (XX: 15). The word "tonight" was a bit strange. Of course, it could be argued that Abram wanted God to help Sarai to pass the night safely, after which he would try to set things straight the next day. However, Abram did nothing after that night! Did he only pray pro forma, to soothe Lot?! Certainly, Pharaoh would defile her the next evening, if he did not get the chance that night! Then Abram would have gotten rid of her in a very sophisticated way. However, God saw through Abram.

To the audience God's action must have been a bit disappointing: Abram has asked God to show forth His great hand (XX: 14). Now it looks as if God is not very powerful after all. Of course, He is able to prevent Pharaoh's continued existence, but that only implies that both Pharaoh and Abram are stalemated. Pharaoh cannot have the pleasure of Sarai he planned to have, and Abram is not free to travel, because his wife is still in Pharaoh's house. He certainly could not leave her there, after his dramatic plea to God.

The author has created an immense tension. God does not want to be used. He knows that Abram has told Him half the truth in his prayer. Moreover, Abram's device to ask for Sarai's safety "tonight" was wicked. However, God shows that He gives Abram another chance, and gives him time to change his mind. But Abram lives comfortably in Egypt, and does not think of Sarai anymore.
However, when a period of seven years in Egypt has been completed, the plagues and afflictions become so strong; they prevail over Pharaoh and his house. In the seventh year, the year when slaves used to be set free in later times (BE 1977: 245), God starts his liberating action. The audience will immediately see the connection with the *Exodus* narrative, which is enhanced by the fact that Pharaoh seeks advice from his wise men (see Ex. 7: 11, 22; 8: 7). However, none of them is able to cure him (see Ex. 8: 18). On the contrary, they too, become victims of the evil spirit. And they flee the pestilential Palace.

It seems somewhat strange that Pharaoh did not seek a cure before the two years of XX: 18 had passed. He must have known that there was something wrong, for he loved Sarai a great deal, yet he was "unable to touch her, much less did he know her" (XX: 17). It is possible that all the men in the Palace were ashamed of their impotence, and that the fact that they all suffered of the same defect came to light only when no births occurred anymore. This is in agreement with what Brownlee writes in connection with *Jubilees* 13, where this period also occurs (1964: 76). He suggests that *Jubilees* was used as a Vorlage by the author of the *Genesis Apocryphon*72. However, the audience will, of course, immediately draw a parallel with Pharaoh's proverbial stubbornness in *Exodus*, even at the cost of his subjects73. Whatever may be the case, after two years the situation grows unbearable, not in the least since the survival of the royal family is seriously at stake. Since it was God who had sent the evil spirit, it is evident that He wanted to enforce a solution.

---

72 See my analysis of XX: 18. The opinions about the dependence of one work on the other differ, see Lange 1996: 196, footnote 42.

73 Other indications of his stubbornness can be found in *Exodus* 7: 13, 22; 8: 15, 19, 32; 9: 7, 12, 34, 35; 10: 1, 20, 27; 14: 5- 8, and for the suffering subjects see *Exodus* 10: 7 and 12: 30. See also Vermes 1961: 22- 23.
Column XX: 19 and XX: 20 form a chiasmus qua verb and qua order of groups of people. The author wants to indicate that within two lines God could radically do away with the opposition to the evil spirit. They are no match for Him:

(19) הללו לְהָבֵת להבִּית; מְשֻׁרַּי: הלל אְבִיךְ...  
(20) הַלֹּא יִלְחֶם בְּכָל אֲרֵפָא הַשָּׁמֶשָּׁה הֵם. אֲבוּרָא

Hence, what the audience expected two years ago, is happening now: God shows forth his great hand (XX: 14).

The author proves that he is a good story teller by making XX: 19 much longer than XX: 20. Whereas, he presents the healers in line 19 as the Egyptians might do, viz. with great pride as healers of Egypt, he leaves out the connotation 'of Egypt' in XX: 20. This is to show that the healers do not live up to the expected standard. He makes them diminish, and slink off with their tails between their legs.

In XX: 19 כַּע יָד is repeated before each group of healers which are called to the king. By doing so the author emphasises their importance, but in XX: 20 he omits כַּע before the 'magicians', although the context (לָהֲבֵת; לאו יִלָּחֶם וְכָל הָבֵת; כַּע) indicates that all of them were also afflicted. The function of this is to show that the Egyptian verbosity is broken, and that the time of boasting is over.

The author presents the spirit as very aggressive, for it prevails over everybody in Pharaoh's house. The only conclusion which the audience can arrive at, is that the Sender of the spirit must be more powerful than any power in Egypt. The sequence, created by the fact that God "only" made Pharaoh unable to defile her for more than one night, is broken. Moreover, it seems as if Pharaoh will be forced to acknowledge that God is greater than he (XX: 15). The author keeps his audience in suspense for a little longer, as can be seen in what follows.
When Pharaoh's healers have dramatically failed and have fled from the scene, and when Pharaoh's court is in deep trouble, the author makes Horqonwash appear on the scene again. This augurs nothing good. He was one of the princes who praised Sarai to Pharaoh. However, this time, the purpose of his visit is not Abram’s wife, she has already been obtained, but Abram’s words. Horqonwash has seen Abram in a dream, and consequently thinks that he can find a cure for Pharaoh’s ailment. His attitude sets the mind of the audience at rest, for he begs Abram to come and pray for Pharaoh. Hereby, the author introduces a favourable turn in the plot, which does not have a forced character. Dreams are considered to come from God in the literature of this period (see Appendix C). Consequently, it can be deduced that God did not only aggravate the plagues and afflictions in order to make Pharaoh look for a solution, but that He was also the One who provided the real solution.

It is ironic that a person named after the Egyptian god Horus (see Grelot 1971: 564), is dependent on Abram’s God for the solution of Pharaoh’s trouble. Hence, the author mocks Horus, who could not achieve anything against the evil spirit. The message is clear: where the God of Abram is, other powers are worthless.

Horqonwash begs that Abram will come and pray for Pharaoh, and lay his hands upon him that he might live (XX: 21- 22). During Horqonwash's visit in XIX: 24ff Abram read from Enoch’s book. It is likely that Abram also spoke about God on that occasion. When Abram appeared in the dream, it was evident to Horqonwash that Abram would be able to mediate. Abram's prayer in XX: 15- 16, "that it may be known about you, my Lord, that you are the Lord of all the kings of the earth", seems to be coming true.

The fact that Horqonwash comes to Abram for help, indicates that he must have
been unaware of the distress which Pharaoh has brought to Abram's house. This supports the suspicion that Abram had all along passed his wife off for his sister. But then the author introduces a *deus ex machina*, who gives *momentum* to the story. Abram does not get a chance to answer Horqonwash, because Lot does. This is the second time that Abram is supposed to negotiate with someone when another person out of his family speaks on behalf of him. This happened before in XX: 9-10, when Abram was negotiating with Pharaoh. Then Sarai said quickly to the king, "He's my brother", with the result that Abram was not killed. Hence, it seems as if Abram's initiatives to set out, \( \sqrt{22} \), and do things in the first two paragraphs of this pericope have turned into an attitude, which lacks energy and power. Other people have to act in order to unravel the plot. This lack of energy could be explained by Abram's unwillingness to take Sarai back. Abram did not act after the first night that Sarai was in Pharaoh's house; here he does not react when an opportunity to reveal the truth occurs.

It is possible that Lot was irritated by the behaviour of his stepfather. Lot does not allow his uncle to speak, nor does he start his speech with a polite introduction. He goes straight to the point, and states:

Abram, my uncle, cannot pray for the king while Sarai, his wife, is with him. Now be gone, tell the king that he should send his wife away from him, to her husband. Then he will pray for him that he might live. (XX: 22-23)

In this passage Lot is no longer the young orphan who went to Canaan with his uncle and aunt, but somebody who intervenes in his uncle's life. One might argue that Lot draws power unto himself in anticipation of being Abram's heir. If so, he does not strive for material profit, but for justice. The author makes him function as an instrument of God:

1. Lot speaks very authoritatively: "Now be gone, tell...!" אָלָ֨י and יִשת are
imperativi. The angry young man acts like a prophet, and does not fear to address the prince by means of imperativi and figures of speech.

2. Now be gone, tell...!" is an asyndeton. This clipped speech emphasises that only by doing what Lot says the problem can be solved. Horqonwash had better act immediately. The injustice should not last any longer as Lot’s words indicate: יְהֵם יָהֲלֶם הַמֶּלֶךְ לֵאמֹר אֲנִי אַלּוֹ בְּשָׁלוֹם יִשְׁכַּב בְּעַיִן הַמֶּלֶךְ וְיִשְׁכַּב בְּעַיִן יְהוּדָה.

3. The author makes Lot use irony to bring home the message: "tell to the king that he should send his wife away from him, to her husband". Although he describes Sarai as Pharaoh’s wife, Pharaoh has to send her to her husband, i.e. her real husband, from whom he abducted her, and whom he wanted to kill at first. That is the price of life. It is likely that Lot also mocks Pharaoh’s impotence: Pharaoh has not been able to know Sarai, so he cannot even be considered her husband.

4. Lot’s words are very fierce, but they also contain a promise. If Sarai is returned, Abram will do what Horqonwash asked. Hereby the author indicates that God is a God of justice, who has a plan with both Sarai and Abram. His promises remain valid.

Suddenly Horqonwash is confronted with the cause of the plagues and afflictions: Sarai is not Abram’s sister, but his wife! Also, for as long as this situation continues, nothing will change in the royal court. It would be preposterous to expect from Abram to pray for Pharaoh while the latter keeps Abram’s wife in his house. The audience realises that this situation must be very difficult for him, for he was the only prince who praised Sarai before the king who was named in XX: 8. Hence, he was a prominent figure, and it is to be expected that Pharaoh would blame him in some way for this misfortune.

The passage “When Horqonwash heard Lot’s words” in XX: 24 indicates that at
the moment when Horqonwash heard Lot he did not react verbally; there is no description of astonishment, nor anger, nor fear. The author presents Horqonwash as a person, who realises which injustice has been done. Consequently, his reaction is an act. This supports the perception that the Egyptians were not as bad as described in Abram’s pesher, and that Horqonwash did not even fear to go to Pharaoh, and tell him how it all came to pass. Hence, Abram’s interpretation was indeed faulty.

In XX: 23 Lot orders him: אַלּוּ בָּא אוּר לְפָרָה; in XX: 24 Horqonwash indeed אַלּוּ בָּא אוּר לְפָרָה. The imperatives of XX: 23 have become perfecta in XX: 24. Horqonwash follows Lot’s orders precisely, which indicates that he considers him a prophet, in spite of Lot’s young age.

He goes to Pharaoh and states very briefly what he has learnt from Lot. The author describes him as a caring person, who can speak very tactfully, for Horqonwash speaks full of empathy, starting with the seriousness of the ailment: “All these plagues and afflictions with which my lord, the king, is plagued and afflicted” In what follows, Horqonwash does not add the personal pronoun denoting the plagues and afflictions, he is too hasty to tell Pharaoh what he knows. Immediately, he continues with: "for the sake of Sarai, the wife of Abram." The author keeps his audience in suspense by delaying Pharaoh’s reaction.

The “lord”, which Horqonwash addresses in this line, is Pharaoh. Although it is spelt in exactly the same way in Aramaic as the word referring to God, it stands in contrast to the latter, for it refers to Pharaoh only once in this pericope, whereas as an address to God it occurs in six instances in this pericope (i.e. in XX: 12, 13,
14, 15 (2x), and XXI: 2). The narrator suggests hereby that the only real "lord" is the Lord, God, and that Pharaoh is one of the kings subjected to Him as described in Abram's prayer in XX: 13.

In the following part of the sentence "for the sake of Sarai, the wife of Abram. Let them return Sarai, I pray, to Abram, her husband" Horqonwash continues speaking in a very tactful way. First he says "Sarai, the wife of Abram", where the word "wife" stands before "Abram", as if Horqonwash is reluctant to name Pharaoh's antagonist. Later, Horqonwash begs Pharaoh to send Sarai back to "Abram, her husband", thus emphasising that there is no other solution than to face reality, and to face Abram. Especially the fact that the word קִבְרָה (to be substituted by קִבְרָה) is skipped indicates Horqonwash's concern to make Pharaoh favourably inclined to his plea.

In XX: 25, the pivot of his speech, Horqonwash mentions twice that Sarai is Abram's wife. Sarai, a central figure in the narrative, has obtained a central place in Horqonwash's speech. However, in the same line, the narrator makes Horqonwash switch from Sarai being the cause of trouble, to Sarai being an object: Sarai, the cause of Pharaoh's ailment, becomes a mere object, which must be returned to her "owner" (her husband, קִבְרָה), after which the matter will be settled. It is presented as a gentlemen's agreement, in exchange for which Abram will heal Pharaoh. The narrator also presents this downplay of Sarai's importance as part of Horqonwash's strategy to convince Pharaoh not to worry about this woman. On the other hand, Abram is advanced as a great healer, without whose favour Pharaoh cannot survive. This is contradictory to what Lot said in XX: 23. Lot merely promised that Abram would pray for Pharaoh.

Whereas Horqonwash does exactly what Lot tells him to do, he does not literally
quote Lot’s words of XX: 23, as can be seen here:

(23) החלה אפרע את הים אלנבלא
(25) קהל צפוי לאריה לאמבר פעלאת

The word "send" is replaced with "return" in order to emphasise the fact that the "only" thing that has to happen is Sarai’s return to the place she came from, as if that would mean nothing to the king. "I pray", הָנָּה, is the normal (humble) speech of a servant to a king. Horqonwash replaces אָנַחַה with "Sarai", possibly in order not to make the story worse than it already is to Pharaoh.

The honorific impersonal "Let them return", וְזֶה, again, sounds as if Pharaoh is not involved, as if the tidings do not concern him. See, in contrast, the cunning turn which Horqonwash's words took in XX: 6c. It could be concluded that Horqonwash was a master in playing with words. However, the cunning turn in XX: 6c was clearly the result of the author’s ability to put himself in Abram’s place.

In XX: 26 Horqonwash emphasises that Pharaoh will be totally healed by Abram, for he will drive out both the cause and the effect of the illness.

The events in this section happen on the same day as when Horqonwash came to Abram to beg for help, and when Lot sent him to Pharaoh to tell him to release Sarai. The narrator takes ample time to relate all the events that happened during that day. That is to be expected, for the unravelling of the plot takes place at this very moment.

The narrator presents Pharaoh as a real ruler who summons Abram to come to him. He asks: "What have you done to me, why have you repeatedly said to me:

55 The spelling of בֶּשֶׁל in XX: 25, without the final ב in XX: 23 does not change the meaning of the word. It is the final ב, which stands for the *pronomen possessivum* "her".
"My sister is she, when she was your wife?" (XX: 27) Abram must bear the responsibility for what happened due to his interpretation of the dream. It is interesting, that in this instance Pharaoh says that it was Abram who told him that Sarai was his sister. Moreover, he said it repeatedly! So far, the audience only knew that Sarai had told the lie (see XX: 10). What Pharaoh says must be true, for it is not likely that he would reproach Abram for something he had not said. Hence, what the audience already suspected in pursuit of XX: 10 proved to be true! Abram has passed his wife off for his sister, and she could do nothing but confirm this statement!

Pharaoh repudiates Abram for his lie, and emphasises his responsibility for its effects: “And I took her to me as wife!” His behaviour is refined, and shows that the impression that he kidnapped her, is not correct. A second reading of the relevant lines indeed indicates that no abduction took place. The passage המָלַע לְהַעֲבֹד הֵמָּה and המָלַע לְהַעֲבֹד הֵמָּה in XX: 8-9 suggests abduction, for that could be the reason for Pharaoh to kill Abram. However, the way in which Abram’s prayer to God is related, it seems as if Pharaoh did use power to obtain Sarai: יִבְסֵת אֵלֶּה אֵם מִשְׁפֹּטָה (XX: 14). Since God is omniscient, it is not to be expected that Abram would lie to Him, but the audience must realise that Abram’s prayer is part of the author’s narrative in the first person.

It is striking that the word טֶהֶרְתָּ, which occurs three times in Pharaoh’s speech in XX: 27, is never accompanied with the suffix of the first pers. sg. This suggests that Pharaoh has never been able to make Sarai his.

Halfway through XX: 27 Pharaoh’s style suddenly changes. In clipped speech he orders Abram to take his wife and go. Abram and Sarai are no longer welcome in Egypt. However, before they leave, Abram must make right the wrong he has
done.

Consequently, in XX: 29 his style changes once again: "But now, pray for me and for my house that this evil spirit may be cast out from us." He still uses an imperative when he addresses Abram, but what he orders is, in fact, a request. He must admit that he is dependent on Abram for the well-being of himself and his house. Note, that Pharaoh sees Abram in a more realistic light than Horqonwash depicted him. He wants Abram to pray for him, whereas Horqonwash said that Abram would drive out the plague (XX: 26). Pharaoh does not have so much respect for Abram. This is a slip of the author's pen.

The words "So I prayed that he be cured" in XX: 28 reveal that Abram realises that he can do nothing else but to act as Pharaoh says. Moreover, he is in debt with God. In XX: 14 Abram asked God to show forth His great hand. Now that God has done so, it is Abram's turn to use his hands in service to God. Horqonwash, being God's messenger because he reacted upon a dream, asked Abram to lay his hands upon Pharaoh in XX: 22. That is why Abram both prays for Pharaoh as he requested, and lays his hands upon him. The author depicts him as someone who shows his reliance upon God, and who follows God's instructions. He trusts that Sarai will be returned. God acts as requested: "the plague was removed from him and the evil [spirit] was cast out [from him], and he lived" (XX: 29). If the audience were not aware of the truth about Abram's behaviour, they would really have gotten the impression that God and Abram cooperate intensively.

Then a passage full of lacunae follows, in which it seems as if Pharaoh swears that he has not touched, or known Sarai, which was required by Assyrian Law in order to make him exempt from punishment (see 3.5. Text-critical and Philological Notes, Column XX: 156).
This could be interpreted as an attempt to make himself look innocent once again (see XX: 26-27). However, this passage is part of a logical sequence of events:

- In XX: 26-27 Pharaoh shows his indignation about Abram's lie.
- In XX: 28 he requests Abram to pray for him.
- In XX: 29 he is healed.
- In XX: 29-30 he acts in accord with the requirements of Assyrian Law.
- In XX: 30-32 Sarai is returned, and receives gifts.
- In XX: 32 the official transfer takes place, accompanied with proof of Pharaoh's sincerity; by the arrangement of an escort of Sarai out of his jurisdiction, he shows that he will lay no claim to her.

Hence, the author shows that Pharaoh is a careful and responsible ruler, who makes sure that he and his country will not suffer any loss due to his mistake. Note that before he makes his statement in accord with Assyrian Law, he checks whether Sarai has indeed anything to do with his illness, and whether Abram is able to intervene on his behalf. When Abram proves to be reliable, and Pharaoh is healed, the latter makes his statement and lets Sarai go.

At this juncture, the narrator makes Pharaoh play an interesting role. Pharaoh does not pay a retribution to Abram, but he gives gifts to Sarai! Those gifts will be Sarai's own personal possessions (see 3.5. Text-critical and Philological Notes, Column XX: 164-169 and 171). In this way the author shows that Pharaoh had sympathy for Sarai in her difficult situation and that he wants to make it up with her. Pharaoh does not ruthlessly take revenge, neither does he kill Abram after being healed by him. Out of his free will he gives them an escort out of the country. This is a revelation to the audience, who have immediately drawn a parallel between the Pharaoh of this narrative and the Pharaoh of Exodus. This parallel proves to be invalid.
Hence, although the author writes in Abram's name he could not help depicting Pharaoh as a person different from the Pharaoh of Exodus, with a sense of justice in contrast to what Abram expected. After the spirit was cast out, Pharaoh was relieved, and finally had an inkling of what Sarai had endured. Consequently, he wanted to compensate her for her trouble and loneliness, which he did in accordance with Egyptian law. In 3.5. Text-critical and Philological Notes, Column XX: 164-169, I wrote that the possessions could come from different origins, such as the $p$, and possibly a fine or compensation. A fine or compensation would indicate his acknowledgement of a certain degree of liability. Hence, Pharaoh wisely did not specify the gifts.

Moreover, the author wants to show that God is righteous, faithful, powerful, and that His will is done. Sarai could have disappeared from the scene without more ado, had God not intervened on her behalf, and on behalf of His promise.

In XX: 32 the narrator writes that Pharaoh appoints men to escort "me" (Abram) out of Egypt. At that moment, the audience is still in sequence, for in Exodus 8: 28 Pharaoh promised to let the people go and sacrifice in the wilderness, but he withdrew his promise in Exodus 8: 32. Therefore, they doubt whether the adventure is really over, and whether Abram and Sarai's skins are really saved. However, in the above-mentioned it is shown that Pharaoh was not like they expected him to be.

The word "me" הָעַיִן in XX: 32 is food for thought. Above, on the previous page, I have indicated that the escort of Sarai out of his jurisdiction was a sign that

---

74 The author has depicted Pharaoh similar to Abimelech in Gen. 26.

75 Cassuto assumes that the Laws of Middle Assyria were also in force in Egypt. He writes: "Since the legal tradition in its general outline was common to all the countries of the Fertile Crescent, it may be assumed that the provisions of this clause were in force in all the countries of this region" (1974: 357).

78 This is a reconstruction.
Pharaoh no longer laid claim to her. Hence, it was not Abram who was the one to be escorted, but Sarai! The author sees the event from Abram’s perspective, therefore he uses the word “me”. This indicates that, although the dream showed that if Abram and Sarai stood together, they would remain together, Abram has not yet learnt to abandon his egocentric behaviour.

As if nothing has happened the narrator writes laconically in XX: 33: "So I, Abram, went (forth) with very numerous flocks and with silver and gold too, and I went up from [Egy]pt." He takes up the thread of the second paragraph (XX: 10-14), in which he set out for Egypt due to the famine, without paying attention to what happened in the meantime. In contrast to what is written in Gen, 13: 1, Sarai is not even referred to once. The narrator consistently presents Abram’s view on the matter, in which there is no room for Sarai. He does not want to have her, as his prayer to keep her away from Pharaoh tonight indicates. She is bad luck, not only to him, but also to Pharaoh who became impotent due to her. Moreover, it seems as if the author wants to show the audience that Abram’s decision to go to Egypt was good, for he succeeded in surviving, and what is more, he grew rich in flocks and precious metals. And Lot, his young nephew, who was with him all the way, grew old enough to get married (to an Egyptian woman, which suggests that Abram had no problem whatsoever with intermarriage), and grew rich like his uncle (XX: 34). Breeding cattle in Egypt had been a thriving business to both of them. The narrator creates the impression of a peaceful and successful family, journeying from one place to another. Nobody, who has not read the preceding paragraphs would have suspected any trouble to have happened on the way.

However, the audience cannot help hearing regret in the account. This can be seen
at several instances: Abram's praises reveal that he is not very happy with the whole situation (XXI: 1-4). His description of God as: "God Most High... the Lord of the Ages", indicates, that he has to subdue and accept God's authority, because God forced him to. Hence, הָלָה (to go up) in XX: 33 indicates that God forces Abram's morale to go up again. Certainly, Abram would not have left Egypt if Pharaoh did not arrange an escort for himself and his wife.\(^9\) The passage about Abram's gratitude to God is also meaningful: he thanks Him for the wealth and for his return to Canaan, but Sarai is not mentioned. "I praised... and I blessed" in XXI: 2 is a word-pair, which can also be found in the Hebrew Bible in Psalm 104: 35; 115: 18; 135: 21 and in Neh. 9: 5. In the Psalms, this word-pair functions as a conclusion to each psalm individually. Here the word-pair is also part of the conclusion of the narrative.

On the surface, it seems as if Abram is very pious, and this is, of course, the impression the author wants to make, but in reality Abram planned to get rid of Sarai and to live in Egypt. His return to Canaan via the same route as on his way to Egypt, only in the opposite direction, indicates that Abram has to start all over again, and that God's activities in Egypt have forced him to re-establish his relationship with the Lord. This is reflected by the rebuilding of the altar in Bethel, the House of God, which he wanted to leave behind.

### 3.8. Conclusion

The author of the Genesis Apocryphon has written a narrative in which aspects from Genesis 12, 20 and 26 are visible. There is, especially, a relationship with Genesis 12 and 20, which is visible by quotes from those texts (see 3.5. Text-critical and Philological Notes). The text fits in the context of Genesis 12, and

\(^9\) This explains why Abram says that Pharaoh's men escorted "me" out of Egypt in XX:
partly runs parallel with *Genesis* 12. However, there is a close relationship with *Genesis* 20 qua content, which is hidden by the way in which the author tells Abram’s story.

It must be taken into account throughout the narrative that the author writes in the first person singular about Abram. Consequently, he cannot but tell Abram’s side of the story, and it is of great importance to Abram, that his reputation is whitewashed, for he has made very grave mistakes. God has called Abram back to Canaan to start anew. Abram must have felt like a little child who was disciplined by God. He certainly does not want the reality to come to light. He wants to be presented as someone who has been walking with God all the time. This is what the author does.

However, here and there, a slip of the pen can be discerned, indicating, that this is a passage to which due attention must be paid. In those instances phenomena can be found which lead to the right interpretation of the narrative. Some of those phenomena are:

- In XIX: 12-13 “our land” occurs twice, but it is left, and exchanged for the land of *Ham*.
- A convention, which is violated (XIX: 19).
- The switch from one meaning to another (נֵרַכְב in XIX: 19 becomes נָרַכְב in XIX: 21).
- Understatements: “my wife” (XIX: 24), plea for mercy (XX: 12), Lot’s weeping (XX: 11), “tonight” (XX: 15).
- The delay of something, which is expected (five years of quiet in XIX: 23; two years of plagues before Pharaoh was induced to look for a cure in XX: 18).

32. Sarai did not matter; his plans had backfired!
• A confused presentation of the order of events (XX: 9-10).
• A "villain", who acts like any decent person would (XX: 21-26).
• The role of a *deus ex machina*.
• The playing-down of the importance of somebody (Sarai is not mentioned in XX: 33-34).

On the other hand, the passages where the author clearly tells the narrative from Abram's point of view, i.e. the smooth, unproblematic passages, must be considered suspect, and must be evaluated as to which advantage this passage has for Abram's presentation of the matter. The result is as follows:

Above it was stated that the contents of Gen. 20 are very similar to those of this narrative. That must be interpreted thus: it is evident that Pharaoh is not the evil ruler of *Exodus*, but that he resembles Abimelech in *Genesis* 20. Abram, in his turn, is the Abram of *Genesis* 20, who thinks that all the nations in Canaan are lawless after his experience of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah.

In this narrative, Canaan is replaced by Egypt, and Abimelech by Pharaoh. However, the fearful Abram of *Genesis* 20 does not exist in the *Genesis Apocryphon*. The author depicts him as a ruthless person, who decides to leave the arid Promised Land, and to get rid of his infertile wife. He has probably concluded that the land which the Lord promised is not to his liking, and that the Lord is not powerful enough to fulfill the promise of progeny. That is why he looks for greener pastures in Egypt, the land with the abundance of water. After he has abandoned Canaan and has entered Egypt, he decides to devise a plan to get rid of Sarai too. He tells her that he has dreamt, and explains the dream to her. Sarai must now co-operate and announce to all that he is her brother. The story does not say whether she did so, or not. It is evident that she hid herself in order
not to experience problems.
Sarai’s tactic of hiding was very successful, and the couple lived in Egypt quietly and infertile for five years. Then Abram decides to give momentum to the matter.
He tells the Egyptians that Sarai is his sister, after which princes come to visit him concerning his words and his wife (XIX: 24). They subsequently praise her to Pharaoh, who requires seeing her. Abram negotiates with him, and Pharaoh takes her as a wife.
Lot, the orphan, who was taken care of by Sarai, is inconsoleable, but Abram tells him that Pharaoh is a powerful person, who prevails over him. He tries to comfort him by telling him that the only person, who can help, is God. Abram says this, in the comfortable supposition that God has no power in Egypt, for He has not made contact with Abram during the five years that he was there (the dream was Abram’s device; see “eisegesis” and “Sarai’s wisdom” above). So he prays to God in order to soothe Lot.
Fortunately, his supposition seems to be correct, for to a person who does not live in the Palace it seems as if God, indeed, does not react. Sarai stays in Pharaoh’s harem, and Abram goes on breeding cattle, and is very successful (XX: 33).
However, after two years, Horqonwash, one of the princes, who presented Sarai to Pharaoh on behalf of him, comes to him to ask his mediation with God, for there appears to be a terrible plague in the Palace, which has Pharaoh and his whole household in its grip. It even prevails over the Egyptian healers! Horqonwash has seen Abram in a dream, which made him seek help from Abram. Of course, Abram is reluctant to talk to Horqonwash. He understands that Sarai’s stay in the Palace must be the cause of the plague. She has brought infertility to their marriage, and she also brings bad luck to Pharaoh’s house.
However, Lot, who is still angry with the princes, speaks to Horqonwash even
before Abram could open his mouth. And then the truth is revealed. Horqonwash’s reaction shows that he has never known that Sarai was Abram’s wife, and he hurries to Pharaoh to tell him the cure; return Sarai to her lawful husband.

Pharaoh shows his indignation, and makes clear that he is innocent, and that he has not defiled Sarai. He promises to return Sarai, if Abram prays to his God. Abram sees that his deceit has been uncovered, and does as Pharaoh orders him. Pharaoh tries to comfort Sarai with gifts, and shows his sincerity that he will not lay claim to her anymore by organising an escort for her out of his jurisdiction. With regret Abram, who has to follow his wife, leaves the country of abundance, together with his nephew. He does not mention Sarai, for he is too disappointed that he has her back again, and that he has to leave Egypt. However, he realises that he cannot escape God and His promises. That is why he sacrifices in Bethel, the House of God, which he wanted to abandon in the first place.

About Sarai’s reaction the author does not say anything, because he represents Abram’s side of the story.

3.9. The Purpose of the Narrative

Unfortunately, the columns before the pericope are missing. However, since the narrative runs parallel to Genesis 12, it is to be expected that the passage of God calling Abram occurs somewhere before XIX: 7. Hence, God has chosen Abram to make a new start with humanity. At the beginning, Abram is optimistic, but when there is a famine in the Promised Land, and when his wife remains barren with the result that the promised progeny does not come, he decides that he had better make a new start without God, without promises, and without Sarai in the fertile land of Egypt.
Hence, this narrative is about a person, who is not happy to be chosen, and who wants to live like any gentile (note that he gave Lot in marriage to an Egyptian woman). But similar to what happens in *Jonah* 1: 4, 17; 2: 10; 3: 1; 4: 6-11, God does not leave this disobedient person alone. The would-be gentile is forced to keep his despised wife, is forced to leave the beloved gentile country, and is forced to return to Canaan, which is very dependent on God’s mercy for rainfall. When he is back, he must learn to be dependent on God, and to rely on Him.

From the moment when Abram decides to break with God, it is clear that his morale is on the decline. He leaves Canaan, and he invents a dream. By its interpretation he forces Sarai to deny her marriage to him, and to tell everybody that he is her brother, in this way accepting his rejection. By demanding this from her, he makes her cry, but it seems that she keeps her composure, and refuses to co-operate. Then he performs other nefarious deeds to get rid of her, which almost succeed. Thanks to God, Sarai is liberated from the gentile’s harem, and God makes Abram take responsibility for her.\(^80\)

Hence, Abram’s choice not to be chosen has a great impact on Sarai’s life. Sarai, who is chosen with him, is repudiated, which leaves her without rights, and dependent on strangers. The narrative wants to teach the audience that gentile countries and ways may seem very attractive, but if someone is chosen, he or she had better co-operate with the Lord, in order not to miss the goal destined for him or her. When a person turns away from God, that person will become evil and ruthless, causing great suffering to others, both to fellow chosen people, and to gentiles. Moreover, further in the *Genesis Apocryphon* (XXII: 27-34) it becomes clear that God blesses those who abide with Him.

---

\(^80\) The narrative is told from Abram’s point of view. Therefore, it would be conjecture to write about Sarai’s feelings.
CHAPTER FOUR - THE COMPARISON OF THE PERICOPE IN THE GENESIS APOCRYPHON AND IN GENESIS.

In the conclusion of Chapter Three, I wrote that comparisons can be drawn on select sections of Genesis 20. In the Genesis Apocryphon Pharaoh resembles the Abimelech of Gen. 20, and Abram's role in the Genesis Apocryphon resembles his attitude towards Abimelech in Gen. 20; he expects the Egyptians to be lawless, like he expected the nations of Canaan to be lawless after his experience with Sodom and Gomorrah. However, Abram is presented not as a fearful person as in Gen. 20, but as a ruthless person in the Genesis Apocryphon.

The passage in the Genesis Apocryphon fits into the context of Gen. 12, and partly runs parallel with it. In fact, 1QapGen XIX-XXII forms a paraphrase of Genesis 12-15, and in particular, XIX: 9-XX: 32 deal with the same subject as Gen. 12. The beginning of column XIX is likely to have corresponded to what preceded Gen. 12: 18, for it is at this point in the Genesis story that the correspondence begins (Fitzmyer 1971: 105).

The text of the Genesis Apocryphon is written in the first person singular, in contrast to Genesis, which is written in the third person singular.

I have printed in italics all instances where a word is added or missing in one of both texts. In case of a paraphrase of the Genesis text I have underlined that passage.


Due to the corrupted state in which the scroll was found the text preceeding XIX: 7 in the Genesis Apocryphon is missing, resulting in its present opening sentence running parallel with the third part of Genesis 12: 8. At that stage in the biblical book of Genesis the events of God calling Abram, His promise,
Abram entering Canaan, the building of the first altar, and the pitching of the tent between Bethel and Ai have already taken place. A comparison of 1QapGen XIX: 7 and the third part of Gen 12: 8 gives the following result:

It seems as if the *Genesis Apocryphon* emphasises the fact that Abram built an altar *there*, יָם (Jastrow 1903: 1678a), since it repeats that word. Due to the lacunae in the text it is uncertain why יָם should be repeated. What יָם stands for is even missing. It must be (in) Canaan, for XIX: 13 emphasises the fact that Abram leaves “our land” ראניִת. Is it Canaan, Bethel, or even another place in Canaan? It is also possible that the author read יָם instead of יָם יָמִי in *Genesis*, he consequently translated it, and added יָם in the *Genesis Apocryphon*, because that is part of an expression. It could also be a translation of his *Vorlage*.

In 1QapGen the contents of Abram's prayer to God are supplied. Although there are many lacunae, the impression is created that God is associated with eternity.

1QapGen also supplies the reason why Abram "journeyed, going on still toward the south", as it is stated in *Genesis* 12: 9. Abram's aim was probably to reach the holy mountain. Whether that mountain featured before in the *Genesis Apocryphon* cannot be established due to the bad state of the scroll. Which mountain might be the holy mountain is discussed in 3.5. *Text- critical and Philological Notes, Column XIX*: 100.

1QapGen XIX: 9b is a paraphrase of Gen 12: 9:

The word refers to the direction "south" (Jastrow 1903: 322a), whereas means south- country, Negeb, and as such can stand for the direction
The word ידוהים refers to the direction "south" (Jastrow 1903: 322a), whereas נתמן means south-country, Negeb, and as such can stand for the direction "south" (BDB 1979: 616a). The territory in the Apocryphon and in Genesis is, however, the same. 1QapGen XIX: 9 specifies where exactly Abram is going. He travels to Hebron where he consequently lives for two years. It is not clear whether there is any relationship between Hebron and the holy mountain.

Any reader of Genesis 12: 10 is bound to have problems with the fact that Abram simply goes down to Egypt to sojourn there when a severe famine has occurred in Canaan. Firstly, the south-country (Negeb) is a dry land, whereas there is much more water in the north of Canaan. So Abram could have journeyed to the north when the south no longer supplied enough food. Why would he leave the land which God had promised to his descendants?!

Secondly, as I noted in 2.2.3 Notes: 51, the text reads: Abram went down (רָדָה) to Egypt. In Gen. 12: 1 and 7 it was God who took the initiative to make contact with Abram, but here the Lord’s name is not mentioned. Abram undertook the journey to Egypt on his own account. That is why he uses his own ingenuity to prevent problems, which suggests that his morale was also on the decline, as can indeed be deduced from the rest of the pericope. The author of the Apocryphon avoids suggesting that Abram's morale was on the decline by just mentioning that he entered Egypt. In this way he clears his name. Moreover, he writes that there was a famine in all this land (XIX: 10b: וַיְהִי דְבָרָה חֲמָשָׁה, where Gen. 12: 10 only has: וַיִּצְוָה חֲמָשָׁה). Hence, the author of 1QapGen tells his audience that Abram was compelled to leave the Promised Land, for there was no way of surviving there. He takes God's promise concerning his descendants seriously, and takes care that he will survive with the result that the promise can come true. This is also inserted in 1QapGen XIX: 10b and following if compared to the Genesis-text: "...but I had
heard that [there was] grain in Egypt. So I set out to [enter] the land of Egypt" Hereafter, a long description of the abundance of water in Egypt follows in the *Genesis Apocryphon*. The fact that Abram leaves Canaan is emphasised by 1QapGen XIX: 13 "Now we crossed (the border of) our land and entered" The allusion to the fact that they entered the land of the *sons of Ham* in XIX: 13 augurs nothing good. This formulation "the land of the sons of Ham" does not occur in the version of *Genesis*. The fact that Abram exchanged the Promised Land for Egypt of all places (see 3.5. Text- critical and Philological Notes, Column XIX: 105), and the suggestion that he was on the decline were probably sufficient in *Genesis*. The formulations in 1QapGen XIX: 13 and Gen 12: 10b are as follows:

From XIX: 14- XX:8b the *Genesis Apocryphon* supplies information which cannot be derived from the *Genesis* narrative. Abram has an unsettling dream on the night of his entering Egypt, which he explains to Sarai. The result of this is that Sarai doubts whether her stay in Egypt will be opportune. The visit of three Egyptian princes follows, which results in Pharaoh taking Sarai as wife, and this is where the *Genesis Apocryphon* picks up the thread of the *Genesis* narrative (Gen 12: 15) again.

In the meantime, the author of the *Genesis Apocryphon* used material from *Genesis* 12 paraphrastically. E.g., in 1QapGen XIX: 14 alludes to Gen 12: 11, although the contents are slightly different. In 1QapGen Abram has already entered Egypt, whereas in *Genesis* he had come near to entering Egypt.
Furthermore, in Gen 12: 11 Abram says to Sarai that she is "a woman of fair appearance". This is not repeated in the Apocryphon, but exchanged by the dream. If Fitzmyer's restoration of the text is correct, the palm symbolising Sarai in that dream was beautiful. Hence, the author, writing in the first person sg., describes her beauty indirectly. This impression is strengthened by the fact that in XIX: 23a Sarai is afraid "lest any[one] should see her [ ]", and her beauty is described before Pharaoh (XX: 2-8), which indeed is the reason for her being taken. Hence, Sarai's beauty plays an important role, not only in Genesis, but also in the Apocryphon.

Moreover, 1QapGen XIX: 17c: is a translation of Gen 12: 11b: keeping in mind the fact that Genesis is written in the third person whereas the Apocryphon is written in the first person.

1QapGen XIX: 19c: reminds of Gen 12: 12c: hence, plays an important role, not m

1QapGen XIX: 19d- 20 is a paraphrase of Gen 12: 13a: It is to be expected that Gen 20: 5 is interwoven in this translation, for the exact formulation of what Sarai has to say can be found here:

I follow Fitzmyer's version of 1QapGen XIX: 20b, which provides an almost literal translation of Genesis 20: 13:

1QapGen XIX: 20b:  
Gen. 20: 13:  
See also my comment on this line and its word- order in 3.5. Text- critical and Philological Notes, Column XIX: 119.
The fact that Pharaoh's name occurs in XIX: 22 suggests that Pharaoh is supposed to be involved in the adventure from the beginning. This is different from Genesis 12: 11-15 where Abram and Sarai fear the Egyptian people, and do not expect any danger from persons of high rank such as the officials, or even Pharaoh. This is illustrated in Gen. 12: 14 and 15, where there is a line of ascending ranks amongst the Egyptian population. First the Egyptians are mentioned who might have spoken about Sarai's beauty; with the result that the officials of Pharaoh see her, and consequently praise her before Pharaoh. This leads to Sarai's dreadful fate in Pharaoh's house.

The fact that Sarai was kidnapped by Pharaoh was probably so well-known when the Genesis Apocryphon was depicted, that the author did not consider it necessary to follow Genesis so closely, and to name thus the above-mentioned classes of the Egyptian population. The climax would no longer serve to increase the sequence. Instead, the mentioning of Pharaoh immediately, in contradiction to the dream, which leaves space for the different classes of Egyptians, could have been far more exciting to his audience. Furthermore, in order to supply background to the situation and in order to satisfy his audience's human interest in the Pharaoh in casu, he immediately mentioned Zoan, the great Egyptian capital, upon which the Egyptian era system was based (GVI 1961: 703).

1QapGen XIX: 21c, and XX: 10e-16a show Sarai and Abram in great distress. It is probably due to the influence of Hellenistic literature that so much
attention is being paid to the depiction of emotions. This does not occur in *Genesis* (Auerbach 1991: 14).

In XIX: 23-XIX: ? the author of the *Genesis Apocryphon* shows that Abram was to blame for the misfortune which occurred to Sarai after five years of quiet in Egypt. *Genesis* describes Abram as a nomad, who just travelled further when there was no more food in the land. This is a normal practice among the nomads in the region. The only thing that makes his situation different is that this land was not just any land, but the land promised to Abram's descendants. Abram did not realise that God's promises in Gen 12: 2, 3 and 7 made them partners, of whom it would be expected at least to share plans when Canaan was involved. He simply acted as he had been used to all his life. The narrative of *Genesis* renders Abram naturally, as a historical person could have acted (see also Auerbach 1991: 23), whereas the author of 1QapGen tries to hide Abram's involvement in the plot by suggesting that the Egyptian princes came for Abram's wisdom.

1QapGen XIX: 24a: לולעה, הנש: מ-הנר: מסור is a paraphrase of Gen 12: 15a: לולעה. The author of the *Genesis Apocryphon* gives us details about how many princes came, and further in the narrative even provides the name of their leader, Horqonwash (1QapGen XX: 8). It is all a matter of description of the environment in order to get a clearer picture of the circumstances.

XIX: ?- XX:8 deals with Sarai's praise before Pharaoh. In Chapter Three the *Song of Songs, Lamentations* and *Proverbs* 31 were mentioned as literature.

81 It cannot be deduced from the text whether there was still a famine in Canaan by that time.
similar to this section, and Cohen (1981: 48-50) indicated that this passage in the Apocryphon partly represents the classical tradition.

1QapGen XX: 9d: רְדָּתָה לְאָם is a paraphrase of Gen. 12: 19c: רְדָּתָה. Note, that the verb in 1QapGen is a third person feminine passive, since it is a report, whereas the verb in Genesis is in a first person imperfect, reflecting Pharaoh's words.

1QapGen XX: 11b: דַּבֵּרָה מִי קָצָר בָּאָם is a paraphrase of Gen. 12: 15c: דַּבֵּרָה. Note, that the words "by force", פָּרָשָׁה, are added in the Apocryphon. Again, the author tries to obtain sympathy for Abram in his difficult position. He also emphasises Abram's distress in 1QapGen, כי, whereas Genesis emphasises Sarai's abduction.

Genesis 12: 12 and 13 play a pivotal role in the Genesis Apocryphon. The clauses "...they will kill me while you they will let live" and "Say, please, that you are my sister, so that it will go well with me on your count and I shall stay alive because of you" are repeated paraphrastically over and over again in 1QapGen XIX: 19-21; XX: 9-10; XX: 25; XX: 27. Pharaoh's fate is connected with Sarai's sake in 1QapGen XX: 25. In the end both Pharaoh's and Abram's lives are at stake in 1QapGen XIX: 19-21; XX: 9-10; XX: 15; XX: 17-18; XX: 22-23; and XX: 29.

Genesis 12: 14, "And it happened when Abram came into Egypt, that the Egyptians saw the woman was very beautiful", appears very elaborately in 1QapGen XIX: 23b-34(?) Genesis 12: 15, "And Pharaoh's courtiers saw her
and praised her to Pharaoh, and the woman was taken into Pharaoh's house, similarly occurs extensively in 1QapGen XX: 1(?)- 9.

But then some striking differences between the two texts take place. The first one deals with Pharaoh's character. While Genesis 12: 16 speaks of the good which Pharaoh did for Sarai's sake, with the result that Abram's wealth grew, the Apocryphon (XX: 9- 10) bluntly tells us that "He sought to kill me, but Sarai said to the king, 'He's my brother'... And I, Abram, was left alone on account of her, and I was not killed." The Pharaoh of the Apocryphon is presented as an evil person, whereas the Pharaoh of Genesis is seen to be benevolent towards his "brother- in- law" (see also Fitzmyer 1971: 127).

Vermes considers the omission of positive material about Pharaoh in 1QapGen "due to an apologetic preoccupation and a desire to avoid scandal" amongst pious people (1961: 125). I do not agree with Vermes as 3.7. Analysis of the Narrative: 182- 214 shows. I hold, that the author of 1QapGen presented Pharaoh like the evil Pharaoh of Exodus in order to whitewash Abram's reputation. Moreover, I do not agree with Vermes' remark, that the origin of Abram's wealth is explained later in the Genesis Apocryphon, for it is Sarai who receives the gifts in Column XX: 31.

This narrative about a tyrannical king who is in love with a beautiful, married woman, and who wants to kill the husband of the woman, is similar to A Babylonian Tale by Iamblichus (2nd century C.E., Hägg 1983: 32). However, the reaction by the woman is different. The idealised image of a woman in Hellenistic times is that of a woman being "beautiful, chaste and faithful- unto- death" (Hägg 1983: 96). Hence, Sinonis in Iamblichus' Tale refuses to marry the king of Babylon, whereas Sarai seems to follow her husband's advice not to reveal their true relationship. Therefore, Sarai does not really meet the Hellenistic requirements, although she saves her husband's life. Whether the material in the Genesis Apocryphon and in Iamblichus' Tale stem from the same environment (Babylonia) cannot be discerned. However, they are both of Hellenistic origin.
The second difference is connected with God's intervention. In *Genesis* 12: 17 the Lord plagues Pharaoh, although the latter was good to Abram. In *Genesis* it is not mentioned whether Abram asked for God's intervention. However, in the *Apocryphon*, Abram's distress is meted out extensively, and he appeals to God to do justice (XX: 10- 16a). Here the author makes use of a Hellenistic device in order to emphasise that this ancestor was the victim of circumstance, and not some villain who wanted to profit at the cost of his wife.

The author of the *Apocryphon* has extensively paraphrased *Genesis* 12: 17: "And the LORD plagued Pharaoh and his house with great plagues because of Sarai the wife of Abram". God reacts on Abram's prayer that very night; the origin and the character of the plagues are also described as an evil, pestilential spirit, which rendered it impossible to all the men of Pharaoh's house "to touch" a woman (XX: 17- 20). Even the period of two years, during which this spirit was moderately active is described (XX: 18). *Genesis* relates nothing about the way in which Pharaoh found out about the origin of his fate, for that was evident to his audience: diseases were the result of the displeasure of a deity (Walton and Matthews 1997: 38). Contrarily, the author of the *Apocryphon* tells them in full detail. The wise men of Egypt could cure neither Pharaoh nor the men of his house. Instead, the spirit prevailed over all of them, and they fled (XX: 20- 21a). This leaves no other conclusion than that, certainly, a Power greater than the deities of the wise men must be the origin of these afflictions! However, it is only after Horqonwash has dreamt a dream in which Abram featured, that the plot moves into the direction of a solution. Again, it is God who intervenes in order to force a solution. Horqonwash seeks the cure with Abram, and then it is not Abram who speaks to Horqonwash, but
Lot, who speaks as a prophet and explains the reason of the plagues. In this way, the author ensures that nobody will think that salvation comes from Abram. Horqonwash immediately informs Pharaoh of Lot’s words. Then Pharaoh summons Abram to come to him.

Here the texts start running parallel again. The extensions of the *Genesis* narrative in the *Apocryphon* serve to supply more information concerning the character of the power of the spirit.

1QapGen XX: 26b-27b run parallel with *Genesis* 12: 18. Below, the first passage is from 1QapGen, the second from *Genesis*:

In the *Genesis Apocryphon* XX: 26b Pharaoh says: "why have you repeatedly said, "me...". On the other hand, in *Genesis* 12: 19 Pharaoh speaks in the *perfectum*, *אמר,* a tense which is used to state something, and which is often used as a *punctualis* with a preterite meaning. This can indicate lack of change in a certain action, but it does not suggest repetition (Lettinga 1976: 164-165). Hence, this is an instance where the author of 1QapGen has intervened in the rendering of the narrative. *אמר* indicates Abram’s share in the course of the plot, and it illustrates Pharaoh’s zeal to free himself from guilt.

1QapGen XX: 27 is also a paraphrase of *Genesis* 12: 19:
This synopsis shows that Pharaoh's accusation (in small letters) comes first in 1QapGen, whereas in Gen. 12 it comes second. The author of the *Apocryphon* thus shows that his Pharaoh is innocent while he emphasises Abram's untrustworthiness.

The Pharaoh of *Genesis* is more cautious. A certain degree of guilt is basic to his behaviour, although he does not admit so openly. The characters in *Genesis* are more complicated.

When we take a closer look at המבחה אלי לא אמרה and the rest of the fact that the author of the *Genesis Apocryphon* writes in Abram’s name, and chooses to present Pharaoh as the Pharaoh of *Exodus* (Sailhamer 1992: 141-143) in order to whitewash Abram’s reputation.
The tendency to emphasise the negative traits of some, and to absolve others of any defects is also a midrashic phenomenon (Mack 1989: 129).

In contrast to Gen. 12: 19 the Pharaoh of the *Apocryphon* orders Abram to pray for him and his house, in order that the evil spirit may be cast out (XX: 28). Fitzmyer is right when he writes, that Abram's prayer for Pharaoh "is a detail most likely derived from the parallel story of Abram and Abimelech in Gn 20. 17. It is, however, greatly embellished" (1971: 134).

Abram prays, and as an instrument of God lays his hands upon Pharaoh's head to establish healing. Nickelsburg observes correctly, that the author presents Abram as God's:

agent - seer and interpreter of dreams, wise man, speaker of efficacious prayer, and a healer set in opposition to the magicians and physicians of Egypt. Thus he assumes characteristics associated with Joseph and Daniel. (1984: 105)

According to Beyer this is the only healing by imposition of hands in Jewish literature (1984: 176). Manumission as a sign of God's mercy occurs more often in Christian literature. Hence, the occurrence of this phenomenon could date back to the period just before or during the emergence of Christianity. This would then explain why imposition of hands occurs in the *Apocryphon* in connection with healing, whereas in the Hebrew Bible, manumission is usually associated with sacrifices (BE 1975: 269-270).

The manumission of Pharaoh alone is probably sufficient to heal both him and his house. That is to be expected, for it is also due to Pharaoh alone that his whole house suffers. The healing is probably also immediate, for 1QapGen XX: 29 reads "And the king rose (and) [made] known to me" Due to the lacunae it is impossible to tell what exactly is the text of XX: 30, but the impression is made that all kinds of formalities take place, which should be
fulfilled before the matter can be considered closed. Practices from the days in which 1QapGen was composed were discerned both in this paragraph and in

3.5. Text- critical and Philological Notes, Column XX: 163 (from XX: 30 onwards). Hence, it is likely that the author added this information in order to satisfy the human interest of his time. Royal gifts such as silver, gold, garments of fine linen and purple must have kindled the imagination of his audience.

In XX: 32 an example of the supply of background- information and anticipation is evident. Here, the author of the Apocryphon shows where Hagar, Sarai’s slave who gives birth to Ismael further on in Genesis, came from.

The last part of Pharaoh’s speech in 1QapGen (וּזְאַר הַקְּלָלָה מִכָּל מַרְגָּבָה מֶצֶּר) does not feature as speech in Genesis. In Gen. 12: 20 it is merely stated: "And Pharaoh appointed men over him, and they escorted him, with his wife and all he had". This Pharaoh orders as royalty would. Further in the Apocryphon, 1QapGen XX: 32 is similar to Genesis 12: 20:

Similar to most of 1QapGen the narrative about the departure from Egypt is written in the first person singular, יִפְסֵחַ טְפִיָּמִי. Lot features only later, in 1QapGen XX: 33, or 34, and Sarai, the lady who stood lonely in the centre of interest, has almost vanished. Only from the fact that she was handed over to Abram may be deduced that she went with him. The narrator plays down her importance, thus revealing Abram’s relationship with her, and returns to his original theme: an apology for Abram, in which he is presented as a great ancestor, who has a good relationship with God.
The author of *Genesis* pays more attention to the couple. Both Abram and his wife are referred to, which is consistent, for it is their adventure in Egypt. Lot plays no role at all in this whole passage, and is subsequently not mentioned when they leave Egypt. However, the author of the *Apocryphon* uses Lot, whose existence was known from *Genesis* 11: 31, as the poor orphan crying over his abducted aunt, and later as a prophet. By using Lot as a prophet the author suggests that only someone from Abram’s house can tell the origin of the plagues, and no gentile, such as the Egyptian healers. After the Egyptian adventure, the narrative about the parting of Abram and Lot’s ways must follow, with the result that Lot’s appearance as a prophet is also anticipatory; it connects Gen. 11 and 13.

The words מַזְמֶרֵי in the *Apocryphon* show clearly that the bad episode in Egypt is over.

1QapGen XX: 33- XXI: 4 forms a paraphrase of the *Genesis* text, as can be seen below:

1: XXI

ןֹּכֶּרֶת עַלְּאָלָיָא יִפְסֵלָה לָתְּלָא יִפְסֵלָה לָתְּלָא בֶּשֶׁם אֱלֹהָא מְרוֹבָּה

2

לֹא בָּאָלָיָא אֲלָמָרָא דְּרָבָּה חֲסֶנֶה לְעָלְמֶה נַפְּשָה

4

נִּפְרָדָה שֶׁפֶּנֶה בֵּשֶׁם אֱלֹהָא לָתְּלָא בֶּשֶׁם אֱלֹהָא מְרוֹבָּה

34

כַּה אֱלֹהָא שֶׁפֶּנֶה בֵּשֶׁם אֱלֹהָא לָתְּלָא בֶּשֶׁם אֱלֹהָא מְרוֹבָּה

33: XX

תֶּלֶבֶּנֶה פָּרָּה [�单]: [ opioids]
Although the two texts suggest that Abram was rich when he left Egypt, there are some differences between them:

- Firstly, 1QapGen repeats the word אָלי of Pharaoh's command in XX: 27, אָלי in XX: 33, thus showing that Abram had no other option than to leave the land of his adventure. It seems as if the word is repeated with some resentment. In Genesis, on the contrary, Pharaoh's words קָנָה וַלִּין, are not repeated. Instead, there is written יִשְׂרָאֵל which sounds as if narrator is relieved that the adventure is over, and that Abram is on the right track again. The word יִשְׂרָאֵל is repeated in another context, when Abram travels from the Negeb to Bethel in 13: 3, יִשְׂרָאֵל. However, this יִשְׂרָאֵל is no longer connected with Egypt, but with the Negeb (see 13: 1).

- Secondly, 1QapGen XX: 33 connects Abram's name with riches:
emphasizes the fact that Abram was not only a cattle-baron, but that he was also rich in precious metals. In Genesis Abram's name stands immediately before "from Egypt", which embraces "went up" and "from Egypt", and it is said that he, his wife, all that he had, and Lot are now headed for the Negev. Hence, in Genesis the separation from Egypt is evident.

- Thirdly, the passage in 1QapGen XX: 33, which could be considered a paraphrase of Genesis, stands totally in a context of possessions, diminishing the power of the word "from Egypt" here.

These three differences reflect a characteristic which can also be found in Hellenistic novels, viz. "pure delight in narration or description" (Hägg 1983: 49).

However, the author of Genesis had another aim in mind: showing how Abram learnt to rely on God (2.5. Genesis 12: 8-13: 4 as a concentric narrative: 77; and Auerbach 1991: 20). After this adventure he has the right attitude to be able to live in the Promised Land, which he indeed, does not leave anymore. This attitude is later described to his descendants in connection with the commandments in Dt. 11: 10-15.

1QapGen mentions Abram's riches before the fact that he went up from Egypt, whereas his riches are mentioned in Genesis after the announcement that he had entered the Negev, thus connecting the riches with the Negev, which is part of the Promised Land, and not with Egypt.

At the end of XX: 33 Lot is reintroduced in the Apocryphon. I have printed this in lower case, in order to make clear that this passage occurs in Genesis at a later stage. In the Apocryphon the passage functions as a continuation of what has already happened during Abram's adventure. In that instance, Lot
functioned as a prophet, and perhaps that is why he was blessed with many herds. On the other hand, it is likely that the author of the *Genesis Apocryphon* wanted to suggest that the whole family did well out of the Egyptian adventure. This would explain why he stressed that Lot is Abram's nephew by adding זָרַע אֱלֹהִים. A remark explaining the relationship between Abram and Lot is to be expected in *Genesis*, where Lot had been missing during one whole chapter. but it is exactly in *Genesis* where this allusion is missing. Moreover, זָרַע אֱלֹהִים features in the list of possessions which Abram and Lot had gathered. This links the family with wealth.

In *Genesis* Lot also possesses אֹמֶן, in which people would usually be living. This might have induced the author of the *Apocryphon* to write about Lot's choice in favour of an Egyptian wife (XX: 34), which indicates his inclination to move away from Abram and his ways. Consequently, the text suggests that it is not only the quarrel between the herdsmen, which drives Lot away from: Abram and his God (as it is in *Genesis*), but Lot's (evil) inclination. This reminds us of what is written about a strange woman in Proverbs 5: 3; 7: 5, and 22: 14. Hence, there is a link with sapiential literature.

In *Genesis* the passage about Lot and his herdsmen occurs as a connection between Abram's adventure in Egypt and his separation from Lot.

There are some other differences, as can be seen below:

- After mentioning Lot's choice for a wife, the author of the *Apocryphon* sets the mind of his audience at ease by suggesting that nothing is wrong about his choice, for Lot continues travelling with his uncle. Moreover, on their way back they followed the same route as when they went to Egypt. That

---

83 The meaning of הַעֲנָא לַעֲנָא in 2 Chr. 14: 14 is uncertain (BDB 1979: 13b).
means that they were going back to the Promised Land. They travelled until Abram reached Bethel and the place where he (sg.) built an altar. This singular form indicates that their ways are going to part (which will happen in XXI: 5), for the text continues with actions in the first person singular, suggesting that it was only Abram who acted thus: נַתָּנָה כְּרַבְּשַׁתָּהוּ אֶל בֵּית אֵל, אֲשֶׁר בָּאָם הָעָם. It seems as if Lot is not involved in the thanksgivings. Consequently, the sequence increases again.

On the other hand, Genesis does not suggest anything concerning Lot's participation in the sacrifices, since Lot does not play a role in the narrative about Abram's stay in Egypt.

- Whereas in Gen. 13: 4 Abram called on the name of the Lord at the place where he built an altar "before", כְּרַבְּשַׁתָּהוּ בָּאָם, in the Apocryphon Abram rebuilt the altar before he offered sacrifices, בְּבֵית אֵל, in XXI: 1, and prayed there. Here the author of the Apocryphon applies a midrashic method to explain כְּרַבְּשַׁתָּהוּ in Gen. 13: 4. He did not consider it an adverbial phrase of time (see 2.2.3. Notes: 57), but an indication that a second building of the altar was supposed to follow. According to the author the altar was found destroyed. Consequently, Abram had to rebuild his relationship with God, just like he had to rebuild the altar. Furthermore, it indicates that Abram re-introduces the worship of the Lord in Canaan, reminding Him of His promise.

- Another difference between Genesis and the Apocryphon is the place Abram journeyed to. The Apocryphon relates that Abram went back to his altar, which sacrifices Abram offered, מִמָּזוֹן עַל עֵמֶּלּוֹ, and which titles he used to address God; מִמָּזוֹן עַל עֵמֶּלּוֹ, Moreover, it gives us a glimpse of the contents of Abram's prayer, which sums up what he had learnt about God at that stage:
Hence, the author presents Abram as a pious person, who acknowledges that God is responsible for his well-being, and that God has brought him back in safety towards the Promised Land. What will happen there is still unknown, but he has reached it, safely.

The author of *Genesis* describes Abram as someone going on "by stages from the Negev to Bethel, to the place where his tent had been at the beginning, i.e. between Bethel and Ai". Here the journey through the Negev and the place where he pitched his tent are mentioned before the place where he had built the altar. The very fact that he was travelling through the land promised to his descendants was probably well worth mentioning: Abram was back where he should be, and he started there anew. The altar was a landmark and a place of worship, but his very journey through the land indicated his good intentions. That is also why in *Genesis* the contents of his prayer are not given; his words are not important, but his actions are. His piety is reflected in the actions in his everyday life, not in worship.

In 1QapGen, under the influence of Hellenistic literature, the description of sacrifice and prayers plays an important role (in XIX: 7ff; XX: 12ff; XX: 28ff and XXI: 1ff, Hagg 1983: 44-45, 49):

a) Sacrifices show gratitude. This might not be certain in XIX: 7-8, but in XXI: 1-4 it is very evident as I have shown in 3.6. **The Structure of 1QapGen XIX: 7 till XXI: 4**: 180, 182. Noah's burning of incense on the altar also happens after the Flood (X: 12-15); and after Abram has journeyed through Canaan and finds his family home safe and sound when he returns, he also offers to God Most High (XXI: 8-20).
b) Prayer, on the other hand, functions as a means supplying information about Abram, or as a summary of what he has learnt about God (3.5. Text-critical and Philological Notes, Column XXI: 176).

The fact that sacrifice and prayers play an important role in the *Apocryphon* might also lead to the conclusion that it comes from a priestly environment. Certainly, the fact that it was found in a place such as Qumran, with its reputation for deep interest in ritual, might support that conclusion. However, the Hellenistic influences traced in the *Apocryphon*, and the evident indifference concerning the *Apocryphon* in Qumran, since only one copy of it was found there, strengthen my opinion that the function of sacrifice and prayers is to provide more background knowledge concerning the person *in casu* by means of a description (see Auerbach 1991: 2084, and Hägg 1983: 49).

- In 1QapGen XXI: 1 Abram does not speak of a place "as far as Bethel, to the place where his tent had been at the beginning, between Bethel and Ai" as Gen. 13: 3 does (see also Gen. 12: 8), but of a place called "Beth- El", House of God. Both in *Genesis* and in the *Apocryphon* there is an allusion to the altar. In 1QapGen the altar and the name of the place, "House of God", seem to play a very important role. The author suggests that this is where Abram wants to be from now on; close to God. It seems as if he has lost confidence to take the initiative, for in the following verses he merely reacts upon events. In XXI: 5 Lot decides to depart from his uncle, and Abram's reaction in XXI: 6 is that he added greatly to what Lot had. The separation from Lot makes Abram grieve in XXI: 7. It is only after God has

---

84 Fröhlich points out that purity plays an important role in the *Genesis Apocryphon*. This could also indicate a priestly involvement. However, she connects it with the interpretation according to a legal tradition. See Fröhlich 1998: 99 and below.
intervened and reminded him of His promise, and shown him the land, that Abram starts taking the initiative again. After offering a holocaustum, Abram sends an invitation to his friends (XXI: 20 and 21). Abram has found his God and himself again.\(^{85}\)

Hence, the author of 1QapGen suggests that the Egyptian adventure had a great impact on Abram, even in the Promised Land, where it took some time to recover from the shock. It seems as if he had lost confidence ever to have a son (an heir), and this feeling was intensified when Lot left him (XXI: 7-12). The result is Abram's depression. This suggests that Abram did not yet know that once God has made a promise He keeps it.

In Genesis, on the contrary, Abram's repentance makes him start anew, full of confidence, in the land of the promise. He is home again, in the land where he was supposed to live. Gen. 13: 5-13 illustrates his new view on life, and his trust in God. He takes several initiatives. When there is not enough grazing for his and Lot's cattle, and when their herdsmen quarrel, he decides that it is time to part ways. He possibly realises that he cannot build his future with Lot. Lot is not to be his heir, but his own son will be his heir. Hence, Lot stands in the way of the promise. Nonetheless he lets Lot choose a region of the Promised Land, and accepts what is left. Then God intervenes, and tells him that all of the land will belong to his descendants (Gen. 13: 14ff). Hence, the Abram of Genesis has learnt from his Egyptian Adventure that God is with him and that where God is, life is good.

The Abram of the Apocryphon is not so certain of that yet. This could be considered a result of influences from the Hellenistic environment in which the

---

\(^{85}\) This is another instance where the author reveals that Abram's journey to Egypt was a journey away from God and his promises. It took time to accept his defeat, and regain trust in the Lord.
Genesis Apocryphon was written. Hellenistic gods were inconstant and fickle. Hence, Abram possibly awaited a wrathful action by exactly such an inconstant God. However, Chapter Three shows that Abram wanted to leave God and his promises, therefore he felt ill at ease when he was back in Canaan.

4.2. Hellenistic Influences on 1QapGen
The author of the Genesis Apocryphon updates the biblical story for the people of his time. Below is described when and where those people lived, and how Hellenism influenced their lives and consequently, the Genesis Apocryphon.

The Apocryphon probably represents the written Aramaic of Judaea of the first century B.C.E. (Kutscher 1977: 15 and 22). This would be the period in which the narrative emerged, and not the present scroll. VanderKam states that the author of the Genesis Apocryphon cited, and translated, from a Palestinian type of Hebrew biblical text, antedating 100 C.E. (1978: 45 and 55). Hence, the period when, and the environment in which the Apocryphon was written, seem to match if we follow Kutscher and VanderKam.

The narrative was probably destined for a Jewish audience. The prevailing language amongst the Jews of Palestine was Aramaic in the first century B.C.E. (BE 1977: 54; Kaufman in ABD, 4, 1992: 174). This is the period in which Judaea was ruled by the Hasmoneans (Rajak in ABD, 3, 1992: 67b), the descendants of the Maccabees, who originally fought against the Hellenistic religious practices forced upon the Judaean population during the rule of Antiochus IV (175-164 B.C.E). In the course of time, however, the

---
86 This contrasts to what Wise writes in his Thunder in Gemini (1994: 111-119; and Chapter I, note 14: 26).
Hasmonaeans, who were never really anti-Hellenistic (Feldman 1971: 295-296; Maier 1989: 43-44, 50, 53; Applebaum 1989: 22; Rajak in ABD, 3, 1992: 70a), became more and more interested in power, and acted increasingly in contradiction with the Jewish tradition (Rajak in ABD, 3, 1992: 70a). Below follow some examples of this Hellenistically orientated behaviour:

- The combination of the function of leader of the state and highpriest by one person, i.e. Jonathan and his successors (Klausner 1976: 188; Applebaum 1989: 22 and 27; Maier 1989: 39-42; 49-50; Rajak in ABD, 3, 1992: 70a);
- The status of king for somebody not belonging to the House of David; Simon "ethnarch for eternity" in 140 B.C.E., and Aristobulus I "king" in 104 B.C.E. and after him his successors (Schiffman 1991: 102);
- Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 B.C.E.) hung many opponents alive on poles, which was a punishment adopted from the Hellenistic environment (Klausner: 1976: 233-234; Maier 1989: 53; Rajak ABD, 3, 1992: 75b);
- He also employed Greek mercenaries in his army to replace the resettled Jewish manpower (Bickerman 1966: 168; Applebaum 1989: 19, 28; Maier 1989: 52), and inscribed coins with his Greek and Hebrew names (Bickerman 1966: 154; Feldman 1971: 296).

Apart from the royal family, the Sadducees favoured the Greco-Roman culture. Under Herod (37-4 B.C.E.) the Hellenic influence increased (Feldman 1971: 296; Maier 1989: 64-65; Schiffman 1991: 101-103).

---

87 "The Hasmonean régime tended to adopt the hellenistic models of administration it was used to", (Applebaum 1989: 38-39).
88 Applebaum considers the subsequent dictatorial powers of the Hasmonean princes and the taxation involved in Jannaeus' continual warfare as the main reason for opposition against the Hasmoneans (1989: 27).
The rise of Hellenism urged the Judaeans to define their point of view towards their own tradition and towards Hellenism. In this situation the *Genesis Apocryphon* emerged (see also Waxman and Waxman 1971: 310), which admonished the Judaeans to remain a pure nation, and not to mingle with Hellenists. Noah's mother Bitenosh and Sarai functioned as examples; they did not mix with foreigners and consequently, gave birth to children of pure descent who, in the end, obtained land (Fröhlich 1998: 96). If their descendants would follow their example, they would also inherit the land, and be liberated from foreign powers.

I am not certain whether the question of the descent of John Hyrcanus I (134-104 B.C.E.) is related to this admonition. A Pharisee called Eleazar considered him unworthy for the function of High Priest, because his mother was in prison some time during the rule of Antiochus Epiphanes. A woman in such a position could have been raped. Consequently, Hyrcanus could possibly not have the highest degree of purity, required for a High Priest (Lohse 1974: 18-19). The least I can say about this, is that he belonged to a dynasty which was not popular with the author of the *Genesis Apocryphon*.

The *Genesis Apocryphon* was meant to contain narratives from *Genesis*, updated for the Jews of the time. Hence, its genre is "rewritten Bible", but since it updates the stories of *Genesis* it contains midrashic elements (see e.g. Chapter Six: 324 and 332).

Until 200 B.C.E. the Egyptians ruled over Palestine (Reicke 1968: 48-49; Tcherikover 1976: 79-80). Consequently, it would not be surprising if the author of the *Apocryphon* would be aware of Egyptian law of marriage which was valid from 230 B.C.E. onwards (see 3.5. Text- critical and Philological
Notes, Column XX: 166ff). The knowledge of Egyptian names such as Horqonwash might also date back to the Ptolemaic period. However, it must be noted that the author of the Apocryphon had another purpose in mind than writing a historical work. As I have described in 3.9. The Purpose of the Narrative: 217-219, he wanted to encourage his fellow-Jews to stay in Israel and not to mingle with foreigners. The narrative indicates how God chose Abram in order to start a new relationship with humanity. Consequently, He did not leave Abram alone, when Abram decided to abandon his calling, to leave the Land, and to get rid of his wife. Likewise, the Lord will not leave Abram’s chosen descendants: they will have to stay in the Land, and remain faithful to his calling. Hence, his allusion to the great capital of Zoan must be attributed to an attempt to write a historical report. It is an attempt to embellish his story in accord with the Hellenistic way of writing (Hägg 1983: 49).

In conformity with the culture of the period in which it emerged, the Apocryphon is saturated with Hellenistic traits and allusions to the Hellenistic culture. The Hellenistic epic literature has borrowed motifs, techniques, and types of foreshadowing from the Odyssey, and consequently love, travel and adventure play an important role (Hägg 1983: 110). Especially the function of the types of foreshadowing are interesting in connection with the Genesis Apocryphon, where the author hints at what is bound to happen by means of allusions such as the land of the sons of Ham in XIX: 13, which augurs nothing good. Moreover, the dream plays an important role; both Abram and Horqonwash have dreams, which prove to be of great importance for the development of the plot. By means of the dream the author indicates what is going to happen in the narrative. Hence, the audience knows the course of events beforehand. Therefore, in Hellenistic literature what will happen is not
the issue, but **how** it is happening. Thus, the actual course of events is far more important than the outcome of the narrative. The result is that tension is achieved by the way in which the author writes, and by the skilful use of elements of narration, which the audience knew. Hence, descriptions, some of them lengthy indeed, are enjoyed by the audience just for the pleasure, and through the way they are formulated (Hågg 1983: 110-111; Auerbach 1991: 8).

Hellenistic interpolations in the *Genesis Apocryphon* can be discerned in the following instances:

A lengthy description of the abundance of water in Egypt, the addition of the dream which suggests God's involvement, the visit by the princes, the number of princes, and the name of their leader, allusions to Abram's wisdom, the description of Sarai's beauty (and wisdom! XX: 7), the name of Egypt's capital, the addition of words denoting "by force", added to indicate Abram's powerless state. The power of the spirit is described very extensively. Horqonwash's dream and his subsequent intervention are added. The specification of Pharaoh's gifts must have fired the imagination of his audience. The list of possessions, which Abram and Lot had gathered explains that they were wealthy. In 1QapGen sacrifices indicate gratitude, whereas the contents of a prayer tell something about the hero, or about what he has learnt about God (see above: 237, 239-240). Hence, in this last example a characteristic of the Hebrew Bible, viz. the development of a person's character, matches perfectly with the Hellenistic style.\(^{89}\)

---

\(^{89}\) Hågg remarks that in Hellenistic novels "there is never a development in the sense that a character is changed by enduring changing fortunes" (1983: 53). Callisthenes in Achilles Tatius' novel *Leucippe and Clitophon* is an exception, and it must be noticed that this novel was "probably written some time before AD 200" (Hågg 1983: 42; i.e. two centuries later than the
The deepest influence on the Hellenistic novel comes from the Greek *historia*, which was different from our genre history, because it included "the exploration of the world in all its aspects and the reporting of what has been seen and heard" (Hägg 1983: 112). Descriptions of journeys with all manner of geographic and ethnographic information belong to the genre. Even mythical material can be found in it, as long as the core of the narrative remains true (Hägg 1983: 112). Hence, the historian has great freedom to invent things of his own. In the case of our pericope, the core which must be preserved, is Abram's decision to leave the Promised Land, with the result that Sarai is abducted.

In the following phenomena in 1QapGen, influences from Hellenistic historiography can be discerned:

- Manumission (XX: 29).
- Egyptian divorce arrangements, dating back to the period in which the *Apocryphon* originated (see 3.5. Text- critical and Philological Notes, Column XX: 166-168).
- The Canaanites, mentioned in Gen. 12: 6b, had disappeared by the time that the *Apocryphon* was written. Hence, there is no reference to them in 1QapGen.90

---

90 Another reason for their absence in the narrative could be the contents of the *Vorlage* of 1QapGen.
4.2.1. The First Person

The pericope in the *Genesis Apocryphon* is written in the first person singular. This is a phenomenon, which also occurs in the *Odyssey*, when Odysseus tells his adventures to Penelope. Achilles Tatius’ novel *Leucippe and Clitophon*, which dates back to the second century C.E., is also mostly written in the first person (Hågg 1983: 42).

The result of writing in the first person is that the narrative perspective is restricted. Only what the hero experiences, or what happens in his presence is related in the narrative. In principle the reactions of other people:

are described only through their visible or audible emotional expressions; incidents taking place elsewhere are mentioned only if and when the hero is informed about them. (Hågg 1983: 42)

The result is that the reader shares the perspective and the limited knowledge of the person who relates the narrative (Hågg 1983: 42).

Accordingly, in the *Genesis Apocryphon*, we see that it indeed, begins with “I, Abram” relating his journey through Canaan. At a certain moment he finds that there is a famine in the whole Land. The fact that he describes it as חסא מארשים לא חלום indicates that he wants to plead innocence (XIX: 10). He presents his leaving the Promised Land after he heard that there was grain in Egypt, as if it is a logical course of the narrative. However, the God of the beginning of the narrative is completely absent in the decision-making. Yet, in Egypt He seems to be present again, for Abram dreams, and explains the dream to his wife (XIX: 14-21). The narrator lets Abram tell and explain the dream from his perspective. Sarai reacts in an upset manner (XIX: 21), but it is not made clear why. The only thing that is clear from the remainder of the text, is that Sarai feared to be seen (XIX: 23). Again, the reason for her fear is not given. After five years the hero and his wife receive visitors. In the remaining text Abram is at the centre of interest till XIX: 26, for the allusions are to the
first person singular. The remnant "in XIX: 26 could refer to “her”, and could thus be a switch from Abram to Sarai, but the text is too scanty to draw conclusions about this. Then an unreadable part of the text follows.

The remains of column XX start with the praise of Sarai by Horqonwash and his companions, followed by a description of what happened after Sarai’s praise. Where this happens is not related, but since Pharaoh was present and sent off in haste for Sarai, it seems logical that it took place at the royal court. Since the beginning of the passage has not been preserved, the reader lacks information as to how Abram was able to tell this. Moreover, it is not transmitted how and when Abram arrived at the palace; it is only said that he was negotiating about what concerned Sarai, and that Pharaoh wanted to kill him, but that Sarai saved him by saying: כִּי חַי יְהוָה (XX: 9-10). This is a typical example of an illogical account by someone, who wants to present his case better than it is, for it is strange that Abram speaks of Pharaoh wanting to kill him, while they are still negotiating about Sarai. It is to be doubted whether Sarai really had to save Abram’s life by telling a lie.

Then another passage follows, in which Abram continues telling the story from his point of view. Without any reference to the place where Abram and Lot were, whether they were in the palace or in their tents, the narrator tells that they are sad about the loss of Sarai, and after Abram has prayed to God he is silent (XX: 16). The rendition of the prayer functions as a plea to the audience to take Abram’s side, for it shows Abram as a victim in despair, who knows that the only person who can help is God.

It seems as if the scene and the narrator are changed in column XX: 16, for God’s activity in Pharaoh’s house is described. This could not be information supplied by Abram, it is only an omniscient narrator who could know what is going on in Pharaoh’s bedroom. However, this passage functions as an attempt
to put Abram in a favourable light, for it is followed by Horqonwash’s plea. Hence, the author is in league with Abram. Of course, it is possible that Horqonwash was Abram’s source about what was going on in the Palace, but that is not stated in the text.

In XX: 21 Horqonwash arrives at the scene, begging for help. Again, a passage witnessed by the hero follows, until Horqonwash arrives in the royal court (XX: 24).

Then the narrator takes over again, and relays the message, which Horqonwash conveyed, but again his source is not supplied.

In XX: 26 the author switches over to his own eyewitness report: he is summoned to come to Pharaoh, after which the denouement takes place. It is striking that Abram describes his emotions after his dream, and after Sarai has been taken away from him, but that he does not show emotions after Pharaoh’s indignant speech in XX: 26- 28. He simply says that he prayed that Pharaoh be cured, for it was not opportune for Abram to enlarge upon this situation: Abram was guilty. Likewise, Sarai’s return in XX: 30- 31, which should have been a great moment, is not elaborated upon. Only the material advantages are measured out (XX: 31- 32). Hence, Sarai’s return was problematic.

The report in the first person continues till XXI: 22. There the author continues in the third person until the end of what is left of the scroll. Hence, the author does not strictly maintain the narrative fiction. The author switches from his or her own eyewitness reports to reports of which the origin is questionable. Nonetheless, the narrative is consistently told from Abram’s point of view. The following instances which look strange, or which make the audience feel uneasy, take place in passages written in the first person:

- XIX: 13: the allusion to the land of the sons of Ham;
- XIX: 19: Abram’s pesher in contrast to the tradition that women explain dreams;
- XIX: 23: five years of quiet in contrast to Abram’s pesher;
- XIX: 24: the slip of the tongue in the passage about the princes, who came “concerning [my]words and my wife”;
- XX: 9-10: the order of the lie and the negotiations on Abram’s account;
- XX: 12: the plea for mercy seems superfluous;
- XX: 15: Abram’s prayer that Pharaoh may not have power to defile his wife “tonight” (only);
- XX: 21: Horqonwash came begging for help, which indicates that he did not have the bad conscience, which was to be expected if he played the role as described by Abram in the narrative;
- XX: 22: Lot speaks instead of his uncle;
- XX: 32: Abram tells that he is escorted out of Egypt, which runs parallel to Gen. 12: 20, but in 1QapGen it is Sarai who is sent out of Pharaoh’s jurisdiction;
- XX: 33ff: Sarai is not mentioned when they leave Egypt.

The following odd passages describe what happened during Abram’s absence:
- XX: 9: there is no allusion to an abduction of Sarai; Pharaoh merely sent off for her in haste (and) had her brought (to him);
- XX: 18: God makes the evil spirit strong, and only after two years Pharaoh seeks a cure.

The structural analysis of the Genesis Apocryphon runs more or less parallel with the one of the Genesis account, although it is greatly expanded on. Hence, it is not by means of the structure of the narrative that Abram’s true intentions in 1QapGen can be revealed. It is only by paying attention to the fact that the
author has taken Abram’s stand in the *Apocryphon*, that the truth can be revealed. This can be done by the analysis of odd passages and words, and by reflecting on whether Abram’s reputation profits by those passages and words, or whether they can be considered slips of the author’s pen.

In *Genesis*, which is written in the third person, hence, by a literary omniscient author as Fokkelman writes (1995: 57), Abram does not have this mean character. He certainly makes mistakes; he forgets his calling out of fear for nature, i.e. famine, and journeys to Egypt on his own account. He also invents the device of presenting his wife as his sister. However, he does not try to hoodwink his wife with an invented dream and its explanation, and he does not make this dream come true by talking about his wife to the Egyptians. Moreover, the fact that Sarai is mentioned at the end of the adventure (Gen. 13: 1) indicates that they went back to Canaan as a family. Hence, he was less harmful, and was in the process of learning to know God and His ways. The author of the *Genesis Apocryphon* has really reshaped the narrative. However, in accordance with the practice in the Hellenistic novel, he did not change the core of the narrative (Hagg 1983: 112). Nonetheless, he succeeded in interpreting the story in a very original way.

From what is written about the influence of Hellenism upon the *Genesis Apocryphon* it is clear that the original narrative has been greatly expanded. Much of the extra information is gathered from elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible as stated above, and from extra-biblical sources such as *Jubilees*, as can be seen in the next chapter.

The literary genre Apology also occurs in the *Genesis Apocryphon*. Its author did not only rewrite the *Genesis* narratives; but the audience is also encouraged
to remain faithful to the God who had supported their ancestors through all those centuries. While doing so, the author supplied reasons to be proud of the glorious ancestors at a time when Hellenism was admired by many, and when the Jews and their religion were only scarcely known to the outside world (Stern 1971: 890).

The fact that Abram leaves the land of the promise is hard to accept in *Genesis*. Hence, the author of 1QapGen adds that the famine occurred in all of Canaan, whereas there was grain in Egypt. Therefore, Abram was compelled to go to Egypt to survive.

While Gen. 12: 16 speaks of the good which Pharaoh did for Sarai's sake, the *Apocryphon* (XX: 9-10) tells us that he would have killed Abram had Sarai not intervened. The author of the *Apocryphon* suggests that Pharaoh is an evil person full of power, which justifies Abram's deception of him.

In the *Apocryphon* the magnitude of Abram's distress is broadly meted out in his prayer (XX: 10-16a). Here the author makes use of a Hellenistic device to emphasise Abram's innocence.

In 1QapGen XX: 11b and 14d the words "by force" are added. This is meant to indicate that Abram was no match for Pharaoh, with the result that he was not capable of acting on behalf of Sarai. On the other hand, Lot's stay with Abram had a very good influence upon Lot: he is presented as a prophet in XX: 22-23.

Under the pseudonym of Abram the author of the *Apocryphon* presents the archmothers and -fathers as special people:

- Although Sarai had been in Pharaoh's house for more than two years, Pharaoh did not touch her (XX: 16-18 and 30?). This is important, for it indicates that Sarai remained pure. Consequently, she was still worthy to become the ancestress of a pure nation, worthy of priestly and prophetic
tasks. See also Nickelsburg 1984: 105, and Fitzmyer 1971: 131-132. Fröhlich adds to this; that due to the purity of the female character, her husband, the hero of the story, "and his offspring receive the land" (1998: 96). She discerns a legal theme in three narrative exegetical Qumran texts, i.e. CD, 4Q252 and 1QapGen, and in the biblical book of Genesis (Garden of Eden, Tower of Babel, Cain's fratricide). This theme is "disobedience results in expulsion from or loss of a land" (1998: 99). Indeed, in 1QapGen this theme occurs twice (Bitenosh's innocence of adultery and Noah's purity, and Sarai's purity and her pure offspring), and both instances are succeeded by the division of land, or the promise of land.

- The author of the Apocryphon presents Abram as a wise man in XIX: 24 (the princes came concerning his words and his wife) See 3.5. Text-critical and Philological Notes, Column XIX: 124.

- Chapter Three. The fact that Horqonwash saw Abram in a dream (XX: 22) might suggest that Abram has nevertheless made an impression on him.

- Abram is also willing to be an instrument in the hands of God. He prays for Pharaoh, although it is written in XX: 9 that Pharaoh wanted to kill him; and Abram laid his hands upon Pharaoh's head, thus acting as God's agent in XX: 28-29.

- Abram's relationship with God also seems to be evident in his functioning as a seer and interpreter of dreams (XIX: 14-21).

When all the above-mentioned facts are taken into consideration, the conclusion could be reached that Abram has a special relationship with God, and that he is his agent. However, this is a superficial observation, for the author tries to hoodwink the audience.
The author of the *Genesis Apocryphon* also inserts independent forms in the narrative, such as:

- A dream and its interpretation, intended as divine justification for Abram's subsequent lie. This is, however, different from the contemporary Hellenistic dream report (Gnuse 1996: 96).
- A description of Sarai's beauty, which follows the genre in Arabic literature called *wasf*, in which "die Quasi-Braut (Sara) soll in den Augen eines Quasi- Gatten begehrenswert erscheinen" (Goshen- Gottstein 1960: 96; Fitzmyer 1971: 119-120). VanderKam acknowledges that the "poem may well be related somehow to the *wasf* genre", but that, strictly spoken, the immediate context is not nuptial; VanderKam (1979: 57).
- Prayers, the first of which triggers the plague on Pharaoh, and the second, which summarises what Abram has learnt about God.

According to Nickelsburg (1984: 105) those forms are introduced to create a story richer and more complex that its biblical counterpart. I have shown above that those functions are not the only functions, since a serious *Auseinandersetzung* with Hellenism was necessary at the time when the *Apocryphon* was written.

### 4.3. Hermeneutic Methods in 1QapGen

In the *Genesis Apocryphon* hermeneutic methods can be found, which also occur in other rewritten Bible texts. One of them is called *Kav le- Kav* (Measure for Measure), or *Lex Talionis*. It occurs in XX: 18. There the word "wasf" is applied, which has the same root as נפש in XX: 14. The following analogy can be made: Pharaoh was overpowered by the plagues and afflictions just like he himself had overpowered Abram and Sarai when he took Sarai for himself. Pharaoh was punished in the same measure as he mistreated Abram and Sarai (see 3.5. *Text- critical and Philological Notes, Column XX*: 139).
Another example can be found in XX: 17, where it is evident that it was not a matter of one person who suffered only, but that Pharaoh’s whole house was involved. This, again, is analogous to the suffering in Abram’s house as reflected in XX: 10-11.

Another exegetical method is the psychological reading of a text. Visotzky (1996: 234) considers it a powerful tool for offering consolation to an emotionally needy audience. From the above-mentioned it is evident that the Apocryphon was written for a Jewish audience under the threat of an overwhelming Hellenism. The women in his audience were likely to identify with Sarai. God saved her at a moment in which there was nobody who would take care of her. Moreover, He made Pharaoh give her compensation for the wrong done to her. Furthermore, He started anew with her and Abram, and repeated the promise that she would have a child. Therefore, the women would feel strengthened in their faith, that God is a God of justice. No matter how bad they are treated, God will restore their rightful position, and compensate them for the wrong done to them and, what is more, show evil men that they can neither escape their responsibilities, nor God’s will.

For the men this narrative is ambiguous. The numerous odd instances could make them feel ill at ease, although at first glance, the narrative seems to be about Abram’s walking with God, which works out well: he returns to the Promised Land, and can start anew. Hence, if the men walk with God, He will also deliver them from the hand of their enemies (see also 2 Sam. 22: 1 and 26-31 and Ps. 18: 25-30).
The anachronism is a phenomenon, which is often seen in midrashic exegesis (Visotzky 1996: 231). It is the result of the updating of a text. In 1QapGen anachronisms appear in the following instances:

- In XIX: 13 Abram speaks of leaving "our land" when he leaves Canaan. This is an anachronism, since it did not belong to him. It was supposed to be given to his offspring (XXI: 13; see also Fitzmyer 1971: 110). This anachronism could be the result of the contrast which the narrator wanted to make with the land of the sons of Ham.

- In Chapter Three, I concluded that the allusion to Zoan in 1QapGen XIX: 22 is anachronistic: Zoan was only being built at the time when Sarai was taken into Pharaoh's Palace (see 3.5. Text- critical and Philological Notes, Column XX: 121).

- However, one must take into consideration that the building of Zoan was the basis of the Egyptian era system (GVI 1961: 703). Hence, the author could have mentioned Zoan retrospectively. It was not his purpose to write an account on the real historical data (see also Bernstein 1996: 45, note 17).

- In Chapter Three, I indicated that the gifts which Sarai receives from Pharaoh in 1QapGen XX: 31 reflect the Egyptian divorce practice from 230 B.C.E. onwards, and not from the period in which Sarai and Pharaoh lived (see 3.5. Text- critical and Philological Notes, Column XX: 166- 168). Hence, this is another example of anachronism.

- Manumission as a sign of God's mercy often occurs in Christian literature, whereas in the Hebrew Bible manumission is usually associated with sacrifices (BE 1975: 269- 270). Hence, it is evident that the imposition of hands in connection with healing, is a phenomenon, which does not yet exist in the days of Abram and Sarai, making this an anachronism.
Every now and then a reader finds passages in the Bible where archfathers or mothers behave in a way which is difficult to accept. In their explanation of such texts the sages sought to render those ancestors free of guilt. Visotzky has coined this method of rendering people free of guilt "the solution of a dilemma". He writes that the:

\[
\text{tendency to tidy up and offer balance to the lives of the patriarchs and matriarchs should be understood as more than a manifestation of discomfort with a different moral climate: it was a hermeneutic principle.} \quad (1996: 229)
\]

An example of this method is the addition of the word "all" in XIX: 10b indicating that Abram was compelled to travel to Egypt.

Furthermore, the blame for Abram's moral ambiguity when he asks Sarai to say that he is her brother "is shifted to the Giver of Dreams, God" (Visotzky 1996: 59). However, this is only true in a superficial reading of the text (see 6.3.3 The Presentation of the Egyptian Adventure in the Three Versions: 358).

The dilemma of Sarai's possible defilement is solved in XX: 16b-17. Whereas Genesis does not explicitly state whether Sarai was defiled or not, the Genesis Apocryphon elucidates that Pharaoh did not even have a chance to touch Sarai.

4.4. Methods in Rewritten Bible Texts to Improve the Biblical Text

One of the characteristics of rewritten Bible texts is that the author tries to create a narrative, which is more seamless than the original biblical text. (Bernstein 1996: 38) This can be done by means of re-arrangement, anticipation, and constructive harmonisation.

Re-arrangement is "the moving around of information already contained within the biblical text" (Bernstein 1996: 38).

- Abram acknowledges that Sarai is a beautiful woman, and devices a cunning plan in order to keep her, "as they drew near to the border of
Egypt” in Gen. 12: 11–12. Abram plans this on purpose. In the *Apocryphon*, Abram has a dream at the moment when he has already passed the border of Egypt. According to Fitzmyer’s reconstruction of the text this dream tells that the cedar (Sarai) was beautiful (1QapGen XIX: 14-15). Hence, the moment when Abram realises that Sarai’s beauty is likely to cause trouble in Egypt, takes place at a later stage in the *Genesis Apocryphon*. In *Genesis*, Abram clearly acts cunningly, in 1QapGen the author has hidden Abram’s deceit by inserting a dream. The conventional idea is that it is God who sends a dream, with the result that the blame for Abram’s lie (based upon his pesher) does not concern Abram. Hence, this re-arrangement does not take place to create a logical order, but the logical order is altered and combined with the dream in order to shift the blame for the invention of the lie. Nonetheless, my analysis of the pericope in 3.7.* Analysis of the Narrative*: 191ff indicates that Abram was fully to blame for the dream, the interpretation and the course of the plot.

Anticipation is similar to re-arrangement, but it adds details to the re-arrangement, with the same intention, i.e. to create a more perfect narrative (Bernstein 1996: 38). The word “anticipation” is connected with the idea of expectation, dealing *beforehand* with something. Therefore, I should like to add the notion of time to this definition.91

- Lot’s presence and actions are added in anticipation, for the ways of Abram and Lot depart further on in the narrative. Moreover, Lot could very well be

---

91 If the notion of time were not added, the story in the *Genesis Apocryphon* about Abram realising that Sarai’s beauty could cause trouble in Egypt, should be called anticipation, too, since the dream is an added detail. However, the dream takes place at a *later* stage than Abram’s planning of a device in *Genesis*. Therefore, it is impossible to call that phenomenon in the *Genesis Apocryphon* “anticipation”. Hence, I have called it "re-arrangement".
used as a figure to convey the precarious situation in which Sarai and Abram had been stranded.

- Lot's wife is mentioned in 1QapGen XX: 34. This is not a matter of re-arrangement, since this addition is meant to explain that she was more important to Abram than Sarai, for he considered her the wife of his heir, Lot (XXI: 7). He probably considered her the woman through whom the family would be continued. It also explains why her attitude differed from Lot's during their flight from Sodom. She was an Egyptian, who was attached to a gentile place like Sodom. Therefore, she looked back when they fled.

- "The building of Hebron, and ... Abram's spending two years there, coupled with the five years which he spends in Egypt before Pharaoh's men take Sarai" (XIX: 9 and 23- 24) "is an anticipation of the statement in Num. 13: 22 that Hebron was built seven years before Zoan" (both quotes from Bernstein 1996: 45). Bernstein correctly remarks (ibid.: 45) that this anticipation can already be found in Jubilees 13: 10- 12.

- The mentioning of Hagar in 1QapGen XX: 32 is anticipation, and not merely re-arrangement, since the implication is important (see also Bernstein 1996: 44- 45). If Abram and Sarai did not go to Egypt, Sarai would never have had Hagar as a slave, and the difficult situation as a result of her pride would not have emerged.

The third method in Rewritten Bible texts to improve the biblical text is constructive harmonisation. This is the conscious:

smoothing out of the narrative by means of such devices as the secondary, anticipatory, filling-in of information not found at that location in the biblical text, but which is referred to later. (Bernstein 1996: 50)
Hence, a piece of text, which occurs later in the biblical version, is placed earlier in the rewritten narrative in order to make the narrative run smoother. Bernstein mentions Abram's pesher as an example (1996: 51-55): "[b]ut this is all the favor [that you must do for me]; whe[rev]er [we shall be, say] about me, 'He's my brother.' Then I shall live with your help and my soul will be spared because of you" (1QapGen XIX: 19-20). This is an anticipatory translation of Gen. 20:13, inserted in the narrative of Gen. 12. According to Bernstein (1996: 52) this type of inserted anticipation of a passage occurring later in the original text has long been known as a stylistic characteristic of the Samaritan Pentateuch. It is strange, however, that this "reparation" of the text does not occur in this passage in the Samaritan Pentateuch as it is known today.92

4.5. Non-Constructive Harmonisation
The following examples of non-constructive harmonisation are not hermeneutic phenomena, as far as they have not consciously been constructed, but since they occur in the Genesis Apocryphon and deal with material from Genesis, I have situated them here. They are association, assimilation, and reduction.

The first example of non-constructive harmonisation is association. In association:

the translation or adaptation of a biblical text is affected linguistically by another passage which is analogous to it or with which it shares common elements. (Bernstein 1996: 48)

92 VanderKam (1978: 55) has found that the author of the Apocryphon used an older Palestinian text type of Genesis as Vorlage from which he quoted.
This can be seen in the following examples:

- • In the examples of the text of 1QapGen XIX: 10, which is reminiscent of Gen. 42: 2 (Bernstein 1996: 48).

- • It is possible that the author read הָֽזֶה instead of וּֽהָֽזֶה in Genesis, translated it in 1QapGen XIX: 7 with הָֽזֶה, and added וּֽהָֽזֶה in the Apocryphon, since that is an expression. If this is a correct observation, this is a matter of association.

In case two separate events, which are somewhat similar, "have come to resemble each other more in the course of transmission", Bernstein speaks of assimilation (1996: 48). In comparison with association this is merely a matter of a higher degree of resemblance. Examples are:

- • Pharaoh's inability to touch Sarai in Gen. 20: 4 which is found in 1QapGen XX: 17, but which does not occur in Gen. 12 (Bernstein 1996: 49).

- • Bernstein (1996: 49- 50) also sees assimilation in Lot's words to Horqonwash in 1QapGen XX: 23, "Now be gone, tell the king that he should send his wife away from him, to her husband. Then he will pray for him that he might live", in comparison with God's words to Abimelech in Gen. 20: 7, "Now then, return the man's wife; for he is a prophet, and he will pray for you and you shall live".

The previous combination of elements from more than one wife-sister narrative may be a matter of reduction, since the author's purpose could have been the compression of a text. "That kind of harmonization would be exegetical, in a sense" (Bernstein 1996: 50), since the author consciously condenses the text. Unfortunately, the state of the scroll makes it impossible to
tell whether the author of the *Genesis Apocryphon* did or did not write about both instances in which Abram fled the famine.

### 4.6. Conclusion

In this part of Chapter IV I have compared *Genesis* 12 to the same passage in the *Genesis Apocryphon*. I found that 1QapGen has inserted much material in comparison with the masoretic text. One insertion, which is called constructive harmonisation, and which is similar to the kind of insertions which normally occur in the Palestinian text type, cannot be found in manuscripts of the Samaritan Pentateuch, which are available now. Hence, it is not known whether this insertion was copied from a Palestinian *Vorlage*, or whether this has been added by the author of the *Genesis Apocryphon*, who wrote in the Palestinian tradition.

I analysed the differences between the two above-mentioned texts in detail, verse by verse, and discussed the Hellenistic influences discernable in the *Genesis Apocryphon* and the hermeneutic and other methods, which were used to write the *Apocryphon*.

The analysis in detail shows that the author of 1QapGen seeks to free Abram from the blame for his journey to Egypt; he simply had to survive. This is the same as in *Genesis* (see 2.3. *A Reading of Genesis*: 62).

It also seems as if the author seeks to shift the blame for Abram's lie to God, by stating that Abram concluded to use this device after he had dreamt. Hence, although the author takes care that he does not clearly blame God in that passage, it must have been obvious to his contemporaries that the Giver of dreams, God, had put this means to an end into Abram's heart. However, 3.7. *Analysis of the Narrative*: 191 showed that the dream was probably part of Abram's device to get rid of Sarai (*XIX*: 21: Sarai wept at my words). Abram
had come to the conclusion that God's promises of land and offspring were void, and he decided to start a new life without God, and without his infertile wife, in a new, fertile country.

Therefore, both in the *Genesis Apocryphon* and in *Genesis* the journey to Egypt is undertaken on Abram's own account, and Abram's destination is Egypt (see 2.3. A Reading of *Genesis*: 62; and 2.8. Inventory of the Problems: 80). The *Genesis Apocryphon* is more radical than *Genesis*, for in *Genesis* Abram is ready to sacrifice his wife for his life, whereas in 1QapGen he hands his infertile wife over to another man.

In *Genesis* Sarai has no say, although this adventure takes place due to her existence (see 2.8. Inventory of the Problems: 81). In the *Apocryphon* the only utterance she makes is a very brief and quick remark: "He's my brother". Furthermore, there are a few hints at her distress in XIX: 21-23, but the whole story circles around Abram, whose point of view is presented in the first person.

In the *Apocryphon* there is an allusion to the origin of the wife sister type-scene; the different vocalisations of "might have led to the device.

Pharaoh's role in the narrative of *Genesis* is ambiguous. This is how the author wants to present it in the *Apocryphon* too (XX: 9 he wanted to kill me). However, in 3.7. Analysis of the Narrative: 197, I have shown that Pharaoh probably did not want to kill Abram, but that this was a lie to whitewash his reputation. All the way the Egyptians proved to be decent people, in contrast to what the author wants his audience to believe. When Pharaoh lets Sarai go, he gives her presents and indicates by means of the escort out of his jurisdiction,

---

93 The audience must have expected a very autocratic attitude, because Pharaoh's way of ruling changed from *primus inter pares* in pre-Hellenistic times, to autocratic during the period of Hellenism (Hadas 1959: 24).
that she is free. The result of his escort is that Abram cannot but face the fact that he is back in Canaan with its water problem, and that he has to cope with his infertile wife, not to mention God, who has used Pharaoh to put him back on the way of righteousness.

The origin of Abram’s richness in Genesis are the possessions which he had when he left Haran (see 2.3. A Reading of Genesis: 67), although Pharaoh was good to him too. In the Apocryphon the passage about Haran is missing, but it seems as if Abram, and Lot for that matter, were very successful in breeding cattle in Egypt. The gifts, which Sarai received from Pharaoh, are not included in Abram’s possessions.

In Genesis it seems as if Abram considered Lot his heir (see 2.8. Inventory of the Problems in the Pericope: 81). The same impression can be derived from 1QapGen XXI: 7-10.

The Sitz im Leben in which the Genesis Apocryphon was written is one of Judaeans trying to cope with Hellenism in the first century B.C.E. This results in many instances where the originally Jewish narrative is "updated" by means of Hellenistic devices and the mixture of Hellenistic and Near Eastern literary styles. Since the Genesis Apocryphon presents Abram as a person who wants to abandon God and his promises, it can be deduced that the purpose of this narrative was to admonish the Jews of the first century B.C.E. to accept their Jewishness, and to stand firm against the attractiveness of Hellenism with regard to the pecuniary element. Just like God had called Abram with a certain purpose in mind, he had a plan with his people in the first century B.C.E. Abram could not escape God’s guidance; neither could His chosen people in the first century B.C.E.
While rewriting this Bible-story the author inserted independent literary forms in order to enthrall his audience, and to show the development of Abram's knowledge of God. He also made use of the exegetical methods of the time, which reveal how he purposefully altered the contents of the narrative.

The narrative is saturated with Hellenistic devices, full of intrigue, word-play and humour. It is an adventure to read it, if due attention is paid to the fact that, although it was written in the first person, slips of the author's pen can be discerned which reveal the real narrative.

This double meaning of the narrative is also its weakness. At first glance the narrative solves several problems which occur in the Genesis version, but the reader remains unsatisfied, because the narrative does not seem to tally:

- Although Pharaoh seems to be a villain, he gives presents to Sarai.
- Although Abram has been warned by a dream, he is careless after five years of quiet.
- Although Abram cries when he has lost Sarai, he does not mention her when he leaves Egypt, or when he thanks God at the end of the adventure.

On the other hand, the real meaning seems preposterous. This is the last that would be expected from a great ancestor such as Abram! Therefore, it is not likely that it would be popular amongst religious people. However, it would be very popular amongst people who love Hellenistic literature, for this narrative keeps intact all the facts of the original story; nonetheless the author manages to turn the story upside down. Hence, for people who are especially interested in how the story is retold, this is a masterpiece. In this sense it could have a great impact on Hellenised people, both by the way in which it is retold, and by the moral; once God has called a person, that person cannot escape Him.

Although the Genesis Apocryphon hardly deals with Sarai and her difficult position, it shows God's great care for Sarai, and it indicates that He is a God
of justice and righteousness. Whether this narrative was popular among women, or perhaps written by a woman, cannot be discerned.\textsuperscript{94}

When considering the characteristics of the religious community living in Qumran (see \textbf{1.2.2.1. The Manuscripts of Cave 1: 9}), it is obvious that this narrative was probably never popular there. This can also be deduced from the fact that only one copy of it was found there.

\textsuperscript{94} Hägg writes that literacy increased amongst Hellenised citizens in the second century B.C.E., and especially amongst the women. However, he wonders how many women had attained enough knowledge of literature to be able to "turn to a book for entertainment in one's leisure" (1983: 90-91). It has been suggested on the grounds of novels, in which women were the main character, that there were female authors who used pseudonyms when writing novels. However, this has not been proven (1983: 96).
CHAPTER FIVE - THE HEIGHT OF THE GENESIS APOCRYPHON.

The function of this chapter is to elucidate which poetics the author of the Genesis Apocryphon used in order to rewrite the Genesis account. I firstly describe the poetics, which the author of Genesis used, and then which poetics the author of the Genesis Apocryphon used to give an interpretation of the narrative. The chapter closes with my analysis of the Genesis Apocryphon.

5.1. The poetics of Genesis

The Bible was meant to reveal the truth, which was given by divine inspiration (Sternberg 1987: 34; Auerbach: 1991: 17). This divine inspiration guaranteed the truthfulness of the narratives in the Bible. The truth comes from God, who is omniscient, in contrast to humans, whose knowledge falls short (Sternberg 1987: 47). In the Bible this human shortage is illustrated by leaving out, or by delaying the giving of information (Fokkelman 1997: 130-133). Only the most necessary information is supplied. As a result, the text may have an enigmatic character (Auerbach 1991: 11-12). The audience has to be actively involved in the narrative, and to search for the reasons why things are as they are. In fact, the audience has to search for God and His ways behind the narrative (Auerbach 1991: 18). Every now and then hints are given, or information is supplied at a later stage. God is both the object and the tester of knowledge (Sternberg 187: 47-48). Examples of this leaving out of information can be discerned at the following instances:

- In Genesis 12: 1-4 no reason is supplied as to why God calls Abram, and the name of the land Abram must go to is not supplied (this is given in 12: 5).
- In Genesis 12: 4 it is not written what Abram thought after his calling.
• In *Genesis* 12: 4-5 it is not written why Lot went with Abram.
• In *Genesis* 12: 7 it looks as if the reference to the Canaanites is in passing and superfluous. However, God’s promise in the same verse, viz. that Abram’s descendants will be given this land, indicates that He will find a solution to the problem of the occupation of the Land by the Canaanites.

Hence, all the information which the author supplies, is purposeful (Auerbach 1991: 14). In the Bible there is no attempt to enthrall the audience with beautiful descriptions, like that which is found in Hellenistic literature. Fascination is achieved by ellipses, which necessitate involvement in the search for an answer.

Besides the fact that ellipses are the origin of fascination, ellipses facilitate the development of characters. Since minimal information is given, it is not necessary to elaborate on the psychological processes in the characters, but from their decisions and acts in the Bible it is evident that both they, and their knowledge of God undergo a development (Auerbach 1991: 20).

Fokkelman shows that the authors of the Bible are the creators of the narratives and that, as such, they are literary omniscient (1995: 57-61, 134). Yet, the authors supply only the knowledge, which they want to supply, with the result that they manipulate their audience (1995: 133). This is visible in *Genesis* 12: 13, where the author does not supply the origin of Abram’s request that Sarai must say that she is his sister. Only by reading another narrative of the same type-scene the audience can find missing information (Fokkelman 1995: 134). In *Genesis* 20: 12 Abram says, that he and Sarai are paternal brother and sister.

There are also instances where the author anticipates things, which will happen much later in the narrative (Fokkelman 1995: 141). An example is the mentioning of Lot in *Genesis* 12: 4-5 and 13: 2, although he plays no role at
this stage. Yet, in *Genesis* 13 Abram and Lot part ways, and Abram gives
part of the Promised Land to Lot.

Direct speech is used in the Bible in order to refer to thoughts which are not
articulated (Auerbach 1991: 14). This can be seen in *Genesis* 12: 1- 4, where
God calls Abram, without saying which plan He has, and what He wants to
achieve. The direct speech in *Genesis* 12: 7 is a reaction to the Canaanite
occupation of the Promised Land. Abram’s plan in *Genesis* 12: 13 is not
elaborated. The audience must figure out how the plan works. Pharaoh’s
words in *Genesis* 12: 18 only allude to Abram’s irresponsible behaviour and
Pharaoh’s anger, but it is not explicitly articulated.

5.2. The *Genesis Apocryphon*

The structure of the narrative in the *Genesis Apocryphon* is similar to that of
*Genesis*. Only the narrative of 1QapGen is greatly expanded, with the result
that its structure is also larger (see 2.5. *Genesis* 12: 8- 13: 4 as a concentric
narrative: 73; and 3.6. The Structure of 1QapGen XIX: 7 till XXI: 4: 179).

The poetics of the *Genesis Apocryphon* differ from those in the Bible in that
on the one hand, similar phenomena can be found, but that, on the other hand,
Hellenistic devices are added:

- One of the Hellenistic devices is the use of the first person in 1QapGen.
  This can also be found in *Leuctippe and Clitophon*, which dates back to the
  second century C.E. (Hägg 1983: 42), but which could already be found at
  instances in the *Odyssey* (Hägg 1983: 110). The author uses this device to
  hoodwink the audience, which, by the way, is also a phenomenon in
Consequently, it will not contain much criticism on behalf of his behaviour. It is more likely that Abram’s reputation will be whitewashed.

- Although the dream in the *Genesis Apocryphon* is in agreement with the conventions of the ancient Near Eastern pattern, it is also a Hellenistic phenomenon as far as it gives a foreshadowing of what is about to happen (Hägg 1983: 48).

- The allusions to much eating and drinking in XIX: 27 suggest that Abram holds a banquet as is also known from Hellenistic literature (Hägg 1983: 188; Plato 1982).

- The praise of Sarai’s beauty is an example of Near Eastern love poetry, influenced by Hellenism as Cohen has shown (1981: 50; see also 3.5. **Text-critical and Philological Notes**: 131).

Some rules of biblical poetics have not been described above, when dealing with *Genesis*. However, since they occur in the *Genesis Apocryphon* some light will be shed upon them here.

There are moments where the narrator’s presence is felt in the text. One of these is to be found in column XIX: 12-13, where the author mentions “our land”, the land which is left, twice; whereas Abram enters the land of the sons of Ham, which augurs nothing good. Column XIX: 21 reads: “And Sarai wept at my words that night”, hinting at the possibility that both the dream and its interpretation came from Abram (וָרְאָה). In XIX: 24 the author almost gives away that Abram had spoken about his wife to the Egyptians. Column XIX: 25 can be considered ironic. First Abram speaks that the princes came concerning his words and his wisdom, but Abram appears to read from the words of Enoch. The moments in which the narrator is present are not very clear, because the narrative is written in the first person.
The narrator does not always tell the events and processes in a chronological order as can be seen in column XX: 9-10, where Sarai tells Pharaoh that Abram is her brother “while I was negotiating about what concerned her”. Hence, Abram first started the negotiations, after which Sarai could not do anything but confirm that he was her brother.

Sometimes many things happen in a short period; e.g. in XIX: 13-21 takes place in a few hours time. However, sometimes hardly anything happens over a long period of time, like in XIX: 23 where nothing worth mentioning happens for five years. In contrast XIX: 24-? deals with the visit by the princes, which is broadly measured out. Also, the description of Sarai’s beauty stretches over many lines (XX: 2-8). On the same day on which Sarai is praised, many events take place: Sarai is taken to the palace, Abram negotiates with Pharaoh, and cries with Lot. Abram prays, weeps and is silent.

The five years are only mentioned *en passant*, without emphasis. That is suspicious. Abram and Sarai probably lived in Egypt without any problems, which again raises doubt about the divine origin of Abram’s dream, and the correctness of his interpretation. The two years of plagues before Pharaoh started looking for a cure, are also food for thought.

The discourses are used to render the narrative livelier and to suggest that this is a report of a historical event (XIX: 17-21; XX: 10; 12-16)). The praise of Sarai is added for sheer delight, and to support Abram’s pesher of the dream. Lot’s words to Horqonwash introduce the denouement of the plot.

There are also characteristics of style which look suspicious, e.g. the understatement “my wife” in XIX: 24, Abram’s plea for mercy in XX: 12, Lot’s weeping in XX: 11, and the fact that Abram prays that Pharaoh will not be able to defile Sarai “tonight” only, in XX: 15. Also the playing-down of Sarai’s importance when Abram returns to Canaan is food for thought. Examples are: “and appointed men who would escort me (emphasis mine) out
of Egypt’ (XX: 32), and the fact that Sarai is not even referred to in XX: 34, although Lot’s wife, who does not even play a role in this narrative, is mentioned.

5.3. An Analysis

The book of Genesis indicates that Abram and Sarai went back together to Canaan. In anticipation of the parting of ways in Genesis 13 Lot is also mentioned as Abram’s companion. Attention should be given to the fact that in the Genesis Apocryphon Sarai is not mentioned at all during the return to Canaan, although she was the person due to whose very existence this adventure took place. It is striking that so much attention is paid to the fact that Lot (and his wife, for that matter) travelled back to Canaan with Abram. The question is: why?

Our focus is mainly on the relationship between Abram and Sarai. Why does the Genesis Apocryphon not mention that Sarai returned with Abram? My suggestion is that according to the Genesis Apocryphon, Abram wanted to break his relationship with God, which is reflected in his departure from Canaan to Egypt, and his instruction to Sarai to tell the Egyptians that she is his sister rather than his wife. Hence, Abram abandons both the promise of land and the promise of progeny, for it is through Sarai that his offspring was promised.

However, there is a turning point in terms of the Genesis Apocryphon with regard to his relationship with God. Whereas Abram calls God “the eternal God”, אלהי קבלי, in XIX: 8, he calls God “God Most High”, אלהי תבל, and “the Lord of the ages”, אלהי עולמה, in XXI: 2. Hence, he acknowledges that God prevails over all the powers in Egypt, and that he has no other choice than to subject himself to Him. Abram’s restored relationship to God is indicated by
the fact that he rebuilt the altar in Bethel, by his subsequent sacrifices. and
by Abram’s proclamation that God is דָּוִד לְךָ. Sarai is treated as part of the
package, connected with the restoration of his relationship with God. In
contrast to Abram’s gratitude for his safe return to Canaan, Abram does not
show gratitude for the return of Sarai. The reason might be that the famine is
over, and that Abram realises that there is no other way to restore his
relationship with God than through accepting the Land. However, the case of
Sarai is of a different order. Abram has behaved very indecently towards her,
and it will thus be very difficult to restore their relationship. Hence, Abram
cannot thank God for her return, for although she is with him, their
relationship has not been restored. That is probably also the reason why Lot
and his wife are mentioned. Abram considers them his heirs. This can be
deduced from Abram’s grief that Lot, his brother’s son parted from him in
XXI: 7.
Above, I have alluded to my opinion that the dream was not sent by God, but
that Abram invented it. As dreams were considered divine revelations to
people, Abram used a dream to convince Sarai to cooperate with him.
However, he made two mistakes:
• He did not follow the convention to let someone else (usually a woman)
  explain the dream, which would mean that Sarai was the proper person to
give the pesher, and secondly,
• He interpreted it in such a way that Sarai would clearly be put in a difficult
  situation, whereas he would be safe.
Sarai saw through his device and cried, knowing that she was not able to
change his mind (XIX: 21). She decided not to co-operate, and to hide
herself, with the result that they lived quietly in Egypt for five years. Then
Abram decided to make his dream come true (see 3.7. Analysis of the
Narrative: 189).
The point I want to make here is that my interpretation is completely different from that of Nickelsburg in his “The Bible Rewritten and Expanded” (1984: 105), of Schiffman in his Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls (1994: 217), and of Visotzky in his Reading the Book (1996: 59). They hold that Abram’s dream was likely intended as divine justification for the lie concerning the relationship between Abram and Sarai. Visotzky writes that the author of the Genesis Apocryphon was “terribly uncomfortable with the Bible having Abraham enlist Sarah to lie on his behalf” (1996: 59), and that he therefore invented the dream, with the result that “the blame is shifted to the giver of dreams, God” (1996: 59). My opinion is that the author only wrote about the dream in order to present Abram’s version of the story, for it was written in the first person singular. However, if the audience listens to the narrative, or reads it critically, it is clear that the author did not agree with Abram’s behaviour. The narrator successfully hoodwinked the above-mentioned scholars.
CHAPTER SIX - A COMPARISON OF HERMENEUTIC PRINCIPLES IN 1QAPGEN AND IN THE BOOK OF JUBILEES.

This chapter deals with the reworking of the Genesis narrative in Jubilees and in the Genesis Apocryphon, followed by a brief comparison with Josephus' Jewish Antiquities. The three texts mentioned last, belong to the genre "rewritten Bible". The term "rewritten Bible" was coined by Vermes in his Scripture and Tradition in Judaism (1961: 67; VanderKam 1992b: 62). In this book Vermes carried on the research of the late Renée Bloch into the origin of midrashic traditions (1961: 7-10). Vermes did not use the term to denote a separate genre, but he described it as a kind of midrash in which symbols and traditions were inserted in the biblical narrative in order to explain that narrative. Those traditions could be recent, but they could also date back to the Persian period and beyond. Furthermore, it was possible that the author added interpretations in order to update the text (1961: 8-10, 95, 122). In his The Dead Sea Scrolls in English (revised and extended fourth edition of 1995) Vermes holds on to his original use of the term "rewritten Bible" when he describes the Genesis Apocryphon as "a mixture of Targum, Midrash, rewritten Bible and autobiography" (1995: 292).

However, others have started using the term "rewritten Bible" as a genre, which Halpern- Amaru describes as follows:

First, "Rewritten Bible" uses narrative structure as an exegetical medium for reinterpretation. Hence the key to the unraveling of the rewritten text lies in its implicit as well as explicit relationship to the sacred one.

Second, the rewritten narrative is not offered as a substitute or replacement for the biblical narrative. To the contrary, with the possible exception of Josephus, who wrote Antiquities primarily for a gentile audience, the author

---

95 This is another name for Jubilees, which is also denoted Jub.
96 That is why Vermes also applies terms, such as "midrashist", "midrashic", and "midrash" in connection with rewritten Bible (1961: 95, 96, 124 consecutively).
not only assumes but requires that the reader relate the rewriting back to Scriptures.9
Third, the purpose of the rewriting is to "actualize a religious tradition and make it meaningful within new situations."9
Fourth, although not developed as a theological treatise, the reconstruction that replaces biblical theology in each text is systematically developed and internally consistent. Moreover, the exegetical methods by which the various reconstructions are achieved have their own internal logic. (1994a: 4)

Vermes (1961: 95) and VanderKam (1992b: 60) also mention the intention to provide an answer to exegetical questions, and the attempt to render the biblical story more attractive (Vermes 1961: 125).

When the versions of the Egyptian adventure in 1QapGen and Jubilees are compared with Genesis, it is striking that, whereas the author of 1QapGen expands the narrative greatly, the author of Jubilees has rendered it very concisely as an unpleasant interruption of Abram's stay in Canaan.

Below, I discuss the different approaches in the following way:
Firstly, introductory material concerning the Book of Jubilees is supplied.
Secondly, a brief comparison of Jubilees with the Genesis Apocryphon follows

9 Here Halpern- Amaru clearly stands in the tradition, which Vermes bases upon Bloch's description of rabbinic midrash: the point of departure is Scripture, it is homiletical, it analyses the text, and it updates the biblical text (1961:7). Hence, the Bible is central. However, Müller considers Jubilees the result of an attempt to change the contents of the Genesis- text, which was probably not yet considered "so sakro-sankt..., daß er unantastbar war" (1996: 238). The authority rests upon the prophet or teacher, to whom the book is ascribed. In Jubilees this authority is God, who orders an angel to write the book for Moses. Müller also writes that the author made use of existing traditions, but that he was also creative in order to reflect the theology of the group of people to which he belonged. He is not certain whether Jubilees was written to replace Genesis 1 till Exodus 12 (1996: 238-241).

in order to compare the literary contexts of the narratives. Thirdly, the way in which Abram is depicted in Jubilees is discussed. Thereafter, my analysis of Jubilees XIII: 11-15 is given, followed by a discussion about a possible dependence of the Genesis Apocryphon on the Book of Jubilees. Finally, the Egyptian Adventure in Jewish Antiquities is compared with the other accounts.

Since I have followed Fitzmyer's reconstruction of the text of 1QapGen by means of passages from the Book of Jubilees, I have decided not to consider these passages for analysis. These passages are the following:

- 1QapGen XIX: 8 (Jub. 13: 8 or 13: 16 and Enoch 1: 4 are possibly reflected here, see Fitzmyer 1971: 105), and
- 1QapGen XIX: 10 (Jub. 13: 10 and 1QapGen XXII: 28, see Fitzmyer 1971: 107).

I make use of The Book of Jubilees by Charles (1902) and VanderKam (1989). Where I give a translation of Jubilees it is derived from the one of Charles, unless I state otherwise in locu.

6.1. Jubilees

6.1.1. Purpose and Character of Jubilees

The purpose of the author of Jubilees was to write "the history of the division of the days of the law and of the testimony, of the events of the years, of their (year)
weeks, of their jubilees throughout all the years of the world" according to God's words to Moses on Mount Sinai (Jub. I: 1). Hence, in Jub. IV the author stated precisely when Adam and Eve's descendants were born; in Jub. V the exact dates of the building and the use of the ark, etc. are supplied.

This interest in dates also reveals that the author had a keen interest in calendrial and legal matters. In contradiction to the priests in the Jerusalem Temple, the author of Jubilees used the original solar calendar, which was considered the only valid calendar by this individual. Therefore, the dates on which festivals are celebrated differ from those fixed in Jerusalem (Jub. VI: 33-37; see also Wintermute 1985: 38-39).

In Jub. I: 27 God orders the angel of the presence to "write for Moses from the beginning of creation till My sanctuary has been built among them for all eternity" (Charles 1902: 8). This indicates that the author of Jubilees believed in predestination (see also Jub. V: 13-14). However, this text also shows that this book is supposed to be of heavenly origin, transmitted by an angel to Moses and the elect of Israel (Jub. I: 27-29; XV: 26). Consequently, the character of Jubilees is esoteric.

When comparing Gen. 1: 27-28 to Jub. III: 4-7 a pessimistic view on humanity in general can be discerned. Only Israel, which descended from pious ancestors, is different from the rest of the nations of the world (Jub. II: 31-33 and XV: 26-32). This view can also be discerned in 1QapGen, where Abram is sent back to Canaan in order to start anew with God, his wife and "his" land.

Müller writes that in Jubilees, the ancestors merely function as authority for the introduction of a series of (new) theological ideas, since they are associated with

---

101 "Die universalistische Perspektive, die mit der Abraham- Gestalt der Genesis verbunden ist, ist im Jubiläenbuch in eine partikularistische Auffassung des 'wahren' Israels, das
rituals and commandments which, according to Genesis, date back to later instances in history. In this way, the author sought to preserve the Jewish identity of the audience (1996: 245 and 249-251), and on the other hand, indicate that after going astray, it is possible to return to God, as Abram did (Müller 1996: 253).

However, Halpern-Amaru indicates that the genealogy itself of those ancestors also plays a role, viz. their genealogy indicates how they are. The genealogy of the father is always known in Jubilees. Hence, the descent of the mother plays an important role. If the children have a mother of unknown descent, their way of life will be questionable. If their mothers are related to their father's family in some way, they are pure and pious. Hence, the descent of the mother indicates the purity of the children. Noah is the last of pure descent. His sons are married to women of unknown lineage and in several generations before Abram, his ancestors are married to women from outside the family (Halpern-Amaru 1994b: 618-621). With Terah, a process of renewal begins, when he is married to his cousin Edna, who is the third generation of women of known descent (Jub. XI: 14; Halpern-Amaru 1994b: 621-622 and 625). Abram is married to his paternal sister Sarai, which reminds us of Seth's marriage to his sister 'Azura in Jub. 4: 11. Hence, "Abram confirms the process of return to genealogical purity" (Halpern-Amaru 1994b: 622), and can therefore be used by God to re-establish a relationship with humankind. Abram's piety is expressed by his refusal to worship idols and by his prayer that God "might save him from the errors of the children of men" (Jub. XI: 16-17).
6.1.2. The Author

The emphasis on priestly concerns, the stressing of the reliable transmission of the sacerdotal legislation, and the special role which Jubilees attaches to Levi, indicates that Jubilees was written by a priest (VanderKam 1992a: 1030). Since Jubilees and the Temple Scroll share the characteristic that they propagate the solar calendar, it is likely that the author of Jubilees belonged to the sect which later developed into the community of Qumran (VanderKam 1992a: 1032; Wintermute 1985: 45-46).

6.1.3. Date and Place of Jubilees (S.i.L.)

One can discern a terminus post quem and a terminus ante quem when considering the date when the Book of Jubilees was written. The terminus post quem is ca. 170 B.C.E. if Jub. 4: 19 alludes to 1 Enoch 83-90, "which was written, it seems, after 164 B.C.E." (VanderKam 1992a: 1030). The terminus ante quem is related to the moment when the community in Qumran was formed. Jubilees reflects ideas of the Qumran community, but does not reflect or command "separation from the remainder of the Jewish population" (VanderKam 1992a: 1030). Hence, it dates back to the period before the community near the Dead Sea was formed. The earliest date B.C.E. could be "during the high priestly tenure of Jonathan (152-142) or Simon (142-134)" (VanderKam 1992a: 1030; Wintermute 1985: 44).\(^\text{102}\) According to Halpern-Amaru the nature of the reconstruction of biblical Land theology in Jubilees might suggest that it dates back to an expansionist era, i.e. the period of John Hyrcanus (134-104 B.C.E.;

\(^{102}\) In his article Jubilees -- How It Rewrote the Bible (1992b: 33 and 36) VanderKam mentions 160-150 B.C.E. as date of composition. Nickelsburg infers that the outer limits of dating are ca. 175 and 100 B.C.E. He considers 168 B.C.E. the most likely (1981: 78-79).
1994a: 5), for the author of *Jubilees* is clearly not interested in the fact that the Land is promised to Abraham's seed. "Spiritual regeneration and total repentance, not Land retention, is the crucial issue in the author's present" (1994a: 51). However, this argument in favour of the period in which the Qumran community already existed, is not strong enough, if it is compared with all the evidence for an earlier date, such as the prohibition on nudity, uncircumcision, the observance of the lunar calendar, intermarriage, idolatry, and consuming blood (Nickelsburg 1981: 78-79).

6.1.4. The Egyptian Adventure in Jubilees

The rendering of the story in Jub. XIII is different from the version of *Genesis* and 1QapGen. Moreover, it is very concise, with the result that several problems arising on the grounds of the version of *Genesis* and the version of the *Genesis Apocryphon* are eliminated. Those problems are: Abram leaving the Promised Land; his decline on his way to Egypt reflected in his readiness to sacrifice his wife and the promise in order to survive; the wife-sister type-scene and its origin; the fact that Sarai does not feature in the story, although the adventure takes place due to her existence; and the problem of childlessness and heritage:

11. And Abram went into Egypt in the third year of the week, and he dwelt in Egypt five years before his wife was torn away from him. 12. Now Tanais in Egypt was at that time built - seven years after Hebron. 13. And it came to pass when Pharaoh seized Sarai, the wife of Abram, that the Lord plagued Pharaoh and his house with great plagues because of Sarai, Abram's wife. 14. And Abram was very glorious by reason of possessions in sheep, and cattle, and asses, and horses, and camels, and menservants, and maidservants, and in silver and gold exceedingly. And Lot also, his brother's son, was wealthy. 15. And Pharaoh gave back Sarai, the wife of Abram, and he sent him out of the land of Egypt, and he journeyed to the
place where he had pitched his tent at the beginning, to the place of the altar, with Ai on the east, and Bethel on the west, and he blessed the Lord his God who had brought him back in peace. (Charles 1902: 62-63)

6.2. Comparison of the Contexts of Jubilees and the Genesis Apocryphon prior to the Egyptian Adventure

Jubilees is written in the third person, unless an angel inserts direct speech. On the other hand, 1QapGen is written in the first person till the author switches over to the third person in Column XXI: 34, possibly due to the fact that the Vorlage was in the third person. The opposite occurs in Jub. VII: 26-39. The introduction to Jubilees states very clearly what is the purpose of the book. This is unfortunately missing in 1QapGen, due to the fact that the first columns of 1QapGen no longer exist.

Jub. X: 18-27, the building of Babel, known as "Overthrow" or "Collapse" in the translations of Charles (1902: 84), and VanderKam (1989: 63) successively, corresponds with Gen. 11:1-9. The story does not occur in 1QapGen, possibly due to lacunae.

Jubilees XI and XII deal with Abram's youth and his conversion to God. This cannot be found in the biblical book of Genesis. Due to the bad state of the Genesis Apocryphon it is impossible to see whether anything similar occurs therein.

6.2.1. Abram in Jubilees

Jubilees XI

Jubilees XI firstly describes the state of a world full of evil in which the descendants of Shem live. One of them builds Ur of the Chaldeans where eventually Terah, Abram's father, lives.
According to Jub. XI: 12 Terah's name refers to the destitution which takes hold of the population when swarms of birds eat the seed which the people of Ur of the Chaldeans sow on their fields. Wintermute notes that Terah's name could be related to Arabic root *ṭrḥ*, which means "to grieve, be sad" (1985: 78, note g).

When his first son is born in 1876 *Anno Mundi*, Terah calls him Abram after his late father-in-law. This is a midrashic expansion to *Genesis*, in which the early death of Abram senior functions as a bad omen for the genealogy, for it seems as if the lineage of Abram junior will die out. God promises him children over and over again in Jub. XIII: 3, 20; XIV: 3, 7, 18; XV: 4-10, 19; XVI: 1, until, at last, Abram's lineage continues in XVI: 12-13.

From Jub. XI: 16 onwards, the author greatly expands the narrative about Abram in comparison to *Genesis*. Till Jub. XII: 8 all kinds of interesting details about his childhood are supplied. Abram is a special child, who at an early age begins to understand that it is wrong to worship graven images and live an impure life as described in Jub. I: 11. In Jub. XI: 5 the author tells *a propos* that Abram learns how to write. Whether this means that he can read Noah's medicine books, is not known, for *Jubilees* does not state in which language they were written. If he were able to read them, the evil spirits would not have any power over him (Jub. X: 10-13), which would explain his attitude towards idols. Be this as it may, if Abram is compared with Jacob and Esau, it is clear that only the good (civilised) learn how to write. Esau does not learn how, whereas Jacob does (Jub. XIX: 14).

---

103 Henceforth AM.
104 Müller suggests that Abram's knowledge of writing in Jub. XI: 5 would explain how he realised that his father worshipped idols (1996: 247, note 21).
105 Noah received the knowledge to make medicines after the Flood (Jub. X: 10-13). The knowledge of Hebrew was lost after Babel (Jub. XII: 25). Hence, it is possible that the books were still written in Hebrew, and became useless after the collapse of Babel. The reference to Noah's books in Jub. XXI: 10 does not elucidate in which language they were written.
Writing is also connected with the study of religious books (Jub. XII: 25-28). When Abram is 14 years old (2x7 years) he separates himself from his father, in order not to worship idols with him. Then he also begins to pray to the Creator of all things "that He might save him from the errors of the children of men" (Jub. XI: 16-17). This indicates that Abram has a sense of righteousness, which the others lack.

The indication of 2x7 years is very important, for sabbath-years and jubilees (i.e. 7x7 years) form the frame wherein the whole history of the world is structured in this book. All the important events in Abram's life are connected with a multiple of seven years.

When it is sowing time, and when the land is again plagued by clouds of ravens, Abram shouts to the birds that they must leave, and they obey him. Thereafter, the farmers ask Abram to come to their land and send the ravens away during the whole agricultural season. The result is that the harvest is sufficient to all of them. The next year Abram invents a new sowing method whereby the seed is covered immediately after it strikes the soil. Thereafter, the people no longer fear the birds. Hence, the fact that Abram seeks the Creator-God brings wellbeing to the whole community.

It also increases Abram's power.

Jubilees XII

Abram's increase in power gives him so much confidence that, in 1904 AM, when he is 28 years old (4x7 years), he even dares to urge his father not to worship spiritless idols, but instead, to worship the God of Heaven (Jub. XII: 1-5). While

106 Halpern-Amaru (1994a: 31) writes that Abraham possessed Shem's knowledge of how to thwart Mastema (Jub. X: 12-14 and XI: 11-22). However, he was not born that way as her remarks might suggest. Jub. XI: 17 states clearly that Abram began to pray to God, with the result that he managed to send away the ravens. Hence, there was a
speaking to his father, Abram makes use of the plural form of verbs, indicating that he considers his father a representative of a whole community. Winternute thinks that the author of *Jubilees* has made use of a liturgical unit written for a communal setting, for Abram's words contain poetic features (Jub. XII: 2-5; Winternute 1985: 80). Abram's argument is based upon the idea that if there is no action, there is no existence. The idols do not act, so they do not exist. On the other hand, the results of God's deeds, i.e. words of creation and continuation of His creation, are clearly visible. Hence, He exists, although He has not yet spoken to Abram personally. Since Abram (and the Hebrew language) consider deeds equal to words, God's creation must have taken place by means of words (Jub. XII: 3-4).

However, this argument does not make enough of an impression on Abram's father to make him change his ways. Terah is afraid of the community, which will certainly kill whoever stops worshipping the idols. When Abram tries to convince his brothers, they become angry with him. Consequently, he ceases talking about the subject (XII: 8).

In 1925 AM, when Abram is 49 years old (7x7 years), he is married to the daughter of his father, Sarai. As described above, this choice in favour of a woman of known lineage indicates a return to purity, and as such it is very promising. However, the following is added in the text: "and she became his wife" (Jub. XII: 9). This is contradictory to the normal practice in genealogies (see Jub. XI: 1 and 6-10, and 14-15). Usually, at least the eldest son is mentioned after the remark that a couple is married. However, a look at Abram's age elucidates the anti-climax: it has the length of a jubilee (7x7 years), which suggests that this marriage is to be barren, just like the land should be kept barren during a seventh process of learning to know God and His ways.
year or a jubilee (Lev. 25: 1-13).\textsuperscript{107} Jub. VII: 37, which is defective according to both Charles (1902: 65) and VanderKam (1989: 49), possibly alludes to this law of jubilees too.\textsuperscript{108} In Gen. 11: 30 it is merely said that Sarai was childless.

Jub. XII: 12-14 is a midrashic expansion on the questions how and why Haran died and why the family moved away from Ur of the Chaldeans, and why Lot stayed with Abram (Gen. 11: 28-31; 12: 4). Note, that in Gen. 11: 28-29 Haran dies before Abram was married, whereas the order is opposite in Jubilees: Haran's death takes place in Jub. XII: 14, whereas Abram's marriage is related in Jub. XII: 9. The expansion also anticipates on the question why Lot could never be Abram's heir; he was not of the same religious quality as Abram. Furthermore, it indicates why Abram had to leave the community and the family from which he stemmed. Hence, it is of great importance in the Book of Jubilees.

When Abram is 60 years old he uses stealth to burn down the house of the idols by night. His brother Haran hastens to save the idols, a perfect example of irony, but he is burnt, and loses his life in front of his father Terah (XII: 14). VanderKam indicates that there are different renderings of Abram's age, but he shows that sixty is the correct number (1989: 70). This is an interesting phenomenon, for sixty years is no multiple of seven. The author wants to indicate by means of gematria that this act of Abram has no connection with God's work (seven days of creation, see Gispen et al. 1977: 245). Subsequently, this act is not a deed inspired by God, in contrast to the other deeds, which took place at a week-year in Abram's life. The above-mentioned references to the multiples of seven clarify

\textsuperscript{107} Abram believed that this barrenness would be annulled after his covenant with God; see Jub. XIV: 21: "he believed that he would have seed, but she did not bear". Hence, the infertility concerns the couple, not only Abram.

\textsuperscript{108} In Textual and Historical Studies, 1977: 12, n.30 VanderKam doubts that there is a lacuna in Jub. VII: 37. However, in The Book of Jubilees, 1989: 49, he abandons this view.
that God was working in Abram. Similarly, the word which came to Abram's heart in XII: 17 (an expansion to *Genesis*), and which made him wonder why he gazed at the stars, came from God. Yet, in agreement with *Genesis*, here it is also God who takes the initiative to approach and bless Abram. It is Abram who reacts to God and learns how to be His partner.

In Jub. XII: 15 it is said that Terah left Ur with his sons, Abram and Nahor. This differs from *Genesis*, where Nahor is not mentioned. That change is very functional, and even necessary, in the narrative of *Jubilees* can be seen in XII: 31. In Gen. 11: 31 Terah dies before Abram travels to Canaan; in *Jubilees* he remains behind when Abram departs. The period which Abram spent with his father in Haran according to *Jubilees*, which is not mentioned in *Genesis*, serves to fit the story in the chronological overview, and it is a preamble on the midrashic expansion which is to follow in XII: 16.

Jub. XII: 16- 22a is again an expansion on *Genesis* which functions to show the development of Abram's faith, and his sense of responsibility. After Abram has found out that even the stars are subjected to God, he prays to acknowledge Him and to ask Him to establish him and his progeny, so that they will not go astray from Him (Jub. XII: 20). Furthermore, he asks whether he should go back to Ur of the Chaldees "who seek my face" (XII: 21). In fact, Abram asks God whether he should submit himself to the judgement of the Chaldees. He has done introspection, and has found out that his arson has been an act performed on the grounds of a misconception (XII: 21). Then God answers with these words from *Genesis*:

> Get thee up from thy country, and from thy kindred and from the house of thy father unto a land which I shall show thee, and I shall make thee a great and numerous nation. (Jub XII: 22, emphasis is mine)
God does not allow Abram to be subjected to the judgement of idolators, and wants him to do the opposite of going back; he wants him to break away from the Chaldees, and start anew.

The quote from Jub. XII: 22 runs parallel with *Genesis* 12: 1-2a, except for the words in bold which are an addition (conflation?). The order is also different from Gen. 12: 2b-3. "All the clans of the earth through you shall be blessed" is the conclusion of Gen. 12: 3, whereas it precedes "And I shall bless them that bless thee, And curse them that curse thee" in Jub. XII: 23:

a) And I shall bless thee
b) And I shall make thy name great,
c) And thou wilt be blessed in the earth,
d) And in Thee will all families of the earth be blessed,
e) And I shall bless them that bless thee,
f) And curse them that curse thee. (Charles 1902: 95)

The structure of God's words is as follows: a parallelism can be found in a and b, in which God promises Abram prosperity. Both Wintermute (1985: 81) and VanderKam (1989: 73) have rendered line d in a reversed word-order, which suggests a chiasm in c and d indicating change: the text no longer deals with Abram's fate alone, but the earth is mentioned: all of humanity will be influenced by Abram's decision in favour of God. An antithetical parallelism occurs in e and f, which shows that those who are in favour of Abram will prosper, whereas the people who are opposed to him will perish. Hence, Abram is part of God's plan to draw humanity near to Him.

---

109 Wintermute translates Jub. XII: 23d as follows: "and all the nations of the earth will bless themselves by you" (1985: 81). A similar translation is discussed in 2.1. A General Scheme of *Genesis*: 37)

110 The translations of Wintermute (1985: 81) and VanderKam (1989: 73) indicate that this antithetical parallelism is also formulated in an opposite word-order.
It is noteworthy that the first four lines of verse 23 were already experienced by Abram while he was living in Ur. Hence, his walk with the Lord was successful in his native land, but when God invited him to go with Him to a foreign country, Abram decided to accept his invitation, and to trust that God would have the power to support him there too. This shows how great Abram’s confidence was. He could also have chosen to stay in Ur, and to attempt to continue his successful life there.

Jub. XII: 24-31 is an expansion on Genesis. Again it functions as an explanation of the growth of Abram’s faith as can be seen below. It is interesting to see that, whereas Genesis suggests that Terah is dead when Abram leaves for Canaan, Jubilees describes that Abram left his father’s house when the latter was still alive, and that Abram made a promise to his father that, when he had found a pleasant land, he would return and fetch him to live there.

Jub. XII: 24 is a second answer to Abram’s question not to be led astray in verse 20: God will be the God of Abram and his descendants. Furthermore, God tells him not to be afraid, for He is his God. This is again a reaction to Abram’s statement that he has chosen God and His dominion in XII: 19.

Now that there is a person who seeks God and His ways, it is time that what happened in Collapse (Babel) is reversed: Abram learns to speak Hebrew, the revealed language, the language of creation. Abram takes his fathers’ Hebrew books, and learns to read and interpret them during the rainy season. He even copies them. In this way the words, which have been revealed to the fathers, are read and studied again, and increase in number. God takes up the thread with humanity again.

Jub. XII: 25-31 is a midrashic expansion, which explains how God sent Abram on his way to the Promised Land, and how God makes Terah give him his
consent. In contrast to Gen. 12: 4, where Abram is seventy-five years old when he leaves Haran for Canaan, this happens according to Jubilees in the seventh year of the sixth week, i.e. when Abram was seventy-seven years old. Once again, gematria plays an important role in Jubilees to indicate that this is God's work. God makes an angel teach Abram Hebrew, the tongue of the creation, with the result that Abram fetches his fathers' Hebrew books in order to study them. Their contents make Abram anxious to see Canaan. This is the beginning of the fulfilment of what God conveys to Abram in Jub. XII: 22 "a land which I shall show thee". Abram asks his father permission to go, to see it, and to return to him. Terah blesses him with a blessing that begins and ends with the words "Go in peace" and whose contents remind us of God's blessing in Jub. XII: 32. There is also an aspect in Terah's words which harks back to God's words to Cain in Gen. 4: 14-15. Those words do not occur in Jubilees, but the aspect is found in Jub. XII: 29: "May none of the children of men have power over thee to harm thee" (Charles 1902: 97). This remark indicates that the people of Ur have not yet forgotten Abram's arson.

Not only do Terah's words remind us of God's words and blessings, the very fact that Terah blesses Abram is interesting. Terah's attitude is the attitude of a man who is reconciled with Abram's behaviour. Terah tells Abram to take Lot with him as his son, and when he finds a pleasant land to live in, he must come back and fetch him and Nahor to live there with him. Hereby, Terah indicates that Abram has responsibilities towards his relatives since

111 Brock and Adler have noted that there are different traditions concerning Abraham's age when he migrated to Canaan. Brock considers the version of Jubilees influenced by a tradition, which is earlier than, and independent of Jubilees (1978: 151). On the other hand, Adler considers the various readings the result of the dissociation of certain traditions from Jubilees in the course of time (1986-1987: 117). The two of them do not pay attention to the gematria, which certainly plays a role in Jubilees.
he caused them to leave Ur; he has to provide a good and safe place to live. However, although Abram also states that he wants to return after he has seen Canaan (Jub. XII: 28), he will never see his father again. God has taken Abram asunder, and Abram must leave his father and brother in order to start anew (Jub. XII: 22).

Jubilees XIII

Jub. XIII: 1-4 is similar to Gen. 12: 4-7. A few details are added, such as places, which Abram passed; some details are left out, such as the substance that they had gathered, and the souls that they had gotten in Haran, and the fact that the land was still inhabited by Canaanites. The latter is probably skipped since it was no longer relevant to the author's audience, for there were no more Canaanites in the second century B.C.E. The same can be said about the text of 1QapGen.

In Gen. 12: 7 the Lord says to Abram "To your seed I will give this land." Jub. XIII: 3 runs as follows: "To thee and thy seed I will give this land". Hence, "to thee" is added. This is an assimilation of Gen. 13: 15 where God promises that all the land that Abram sees will belong to him and his offspring forever. In Jub. XIII: 4 the offering of a sacrifice after the appearance of God is inserted in comparison with Gen. 12: 7. This offering indicates Abram's gratitude, and the moment when the worship of God was introduced in Canaan.

Jubilees XIII: 5: "And he removed from thence unto the mountain... Bethel on the west and Ai on the east, and pitched his tent there" represents Gen. 12: 8a and b: "And he pulled up his stakes from there for the high country east of Bethel and pitched his tent with Bethel to the west and Ai to the east". However, in Jubilees the pitching of the tent is mentioned later than in Genesis.

An expansion begins in Jub. XIII: 6. There the Promised Land is described. In
XIII: 7 the calling upon the name of the Lord of Gen. 12: 8d is changed into the blessing of the Lord after Abram has seen the land and the water on the mountains. The building of an altar (Gen. 12: 8c) takes place later, on the new moon of the first month.

Abram's blessing of God "who had led him out of Ur of the Chaldees, and had brought him to this land" (Charles 1902: 98) deserves more attention. This quote indicates both Abram's break with Ur (he accepts God's promise of Jub. XIII: 3), and God's faith in Abram.

Gen. 12: 8 deals with Abram moving towards Bethel, where he builds the second altar on Canaanite soil. Why he does so is not related. Jub. XIII: 8 seems to run parallel to 1QapGen XIX: 7- 8, but I leave this out of consideration, since Jubilees may have been used there to restore the text of the Apocryphon. Jub. XIII: 8 is a midrashic expansion, which shows that Abram built the second altar in order to celebrate Rosh haShana, i.e. the first day of the first month of the year, Tishri. Rosh haShana is the first day of a series of ten days on which one reconsiders one's life with God. On the tenth day, atonement is made for the people of Israel for all their sins (Lev. 16; Num. 29: 1- 11). The author of Jubilees has a metahistorical approach in his rewriting of the Bible. He wants to indicate that the covenants are eternal, and that the ancestors of Israel already submitted themselves to the commandments (Halpern- Amaru 1992a: 33- 34; VanderKam 1992b: 60). Rosh haShana is celebrated before the beginning of the rainy season. Abram has seen that the land is very fertile, and that there is water on the mountains. Yet, he must also have realised that this land is dependent on rainfall. Consequently, Abram sacrifices to God in order "that He should be with

112 The "seventh" month in Num. 29 is the result of a change in the counting of the months of the Jewish year. However, this text deals with Rosh haShana and Yom haKippurim.
him and not forsake him all the days of his life" (XIII: 9). Before I elaborate on this matter, I intend to shed light on the nature of the sacrifice.

In Jub. XIII: 9 Abram offers the second sacrifice on the altar. According to Charles and Wintermute this is a burnt offering, whereas VanderKam merely translates with "sacrifice". If this is indeed a *holocaustum* as Charles and Wintermute suggest, this is an anachronism, for a) it reflects the same practice as stated in Num. 28: 11, which dates back to a period later than Abram, and b) in *Numbers* the offerings of New Moon's Day stand in a context of the Giving of the Torah. However, Jub. XIII: 9 reads that the offering is sacrificed in order that God would not forget His promise of Jub. XII: 24, "And I shall be a God to thee and thy son, and to thy son's son, and to all thy seed: fear not, from henceforth and unto all generations of the earth I am thy God". Hence, this sacrifice must not be connected with the *holocaustum* of *Numbers*.  

It is the promise of Jub. XII: 24, which is of central importance. The reader has to be aware of the fact that Abram has not yet clearly broken with all that God has required in Jub. XII: 22, "Get thee up from thy country, and from thy kindred and from the house of thy father". So far, Abram has only fulfilled one of God's requirements; he has left his country. He feels uncertain and needs God's support. Where 1QapGen XIX: 8b refers to the fact that Abram had not yet reached the holy mountain, Jub. XIII: 9 describes Abram's sacrifice and prayer. Taking into account that the author of 1QapGen shows great interest in sacrifices and prayer, it is interesting that he has not copied

---

113 Wintermute writes correctly that the purpose of the author of *Jubilees* was to adapt the text of Scripture to the period in which he lived. Since his contemporaries were faced with arguments that Jewish ritual law and piety were no longer relevant, and consequently could be abandoned, he wanted to show that the Jewish rites were eternal (written on heavenly tablets, see e.g. Jub. III: 31; VI: 17; XV: 25; XVI: 28-29) and that the patriarchs observed them already. That is, in general, the function of anachronisms in *Jubilees* (1985: 40).
this passage from *Jubilees*. He probably considered it unnecessary, because in 1QapGen XIX: 7 he had already written about the second altar. Moreover, in the *Apocryphon* Abram does not realise that he is dependent on God for rainfall in Canaan, with the result that he did not need to ask reassurance from God. Hence, the context is different.

As a result his interest in Canaan (see Jub. XII: 28); Abram journeys to this Land, which is promised to him in Jub. XIII: 3. After a two year stay in Canaan, the famine leads to the decision to travel further South, because Egypt, where there was no famine, was closer than Haran. Implicitly, Abram was forced to break the promise to his father (Jub. XII: 30-31). This is an interesting phenomenon, for at first glance it is unnecessary. If the author of *Jubilees* remained faithful to Gen. 11: 32, Terah would have been dead by the time when Abram left Haran, with the result that there would be no need of a promise, nor of somebody taking care of the old man. However, in *Genesis* it is written, that Terah died when he was 205 years old. Since the author of *Jubilees* has placed his birth in 1806 AM (Jub. XI: 10), he ostensibly died in 2011 AM. In 1951 AM Abram observed the stars and concluded that he would follow God's dominion. Hence, Abram had to wait sixty years before he could depart to Canaan. The author must have considered the length of a period of sixty years unbearable for an enthusiastic convert. The study of Hebrew and the copying of Hebrew books probably only absorbed the "two weeks of years" of Jub. XII: 15. Hence, an implicit breach of the promise was the best solution to the problem. Moreover, by making Abram break the promise to return, the author indicates that Abram breaks with his background and with his father. He abandons the promise, although keeping a promise is a matter of

---

114 See Sarna 1967: 108, note 12. According to the Samaritan tradition Terah died when he was 145 years old; *i.e.* the year when Abram observed the stars.
honour. Furthermore, the author suggests that God brought the famine in Canaan in order to help Abram stay away from his family, for the famine occurs in the verse after Abram has asked God not to forsake him. Hence, his journey to Egypt stands in a context of a growing relationship with God, and is implicitly the fulfilment of God's conditions for a new start with Abram in Jub. XII: 22. As a result, the verb $\sqrt{\text{יָשֵׁב}}$, which is used in Genesis when Abram descends to Egypt, is not used, because it is not functional. On the contrary, Abram is not on the decline, but his star is rising; he has fulfilled the requirements of the Lord.

Jub. XIII: 10-11 run parallel with 1QapGen XIX: 9-11, but similarly to 1QapGen XIX: 7-8, this is not taken into account in order to avoid circular argumentation (see the beginning of this chapter). The land of the south, Bealoth, in Jubilees is not mentioned in the Genesis Apocryphon, nor in Genesis. On the other hand, the passage "but I heard that there was grain in Egypt" in 1QapGen XIX: 10 does not occur in Jubilees. Neither does it in Genesis, in contrast to what Fitzmyer's italics suggest in his commentary (1971: 59). Neither Hebron, nor the fact that it was built at that time occurs in Gen. 12:9, but the building of Hebron does occur in both Jubilees and the Genesis Apocryphon. The two years that Abram stayed in Hebron must be left out of consideration in connection with 1QapGen, since Fitzmyer used this passage of Jubilees to restore the text of the Genesis Apocryphon (see the beginning of this chapter). Thereafter, the Genesis Apocryphon relates the story of the crossing of the arms of the Nile, a dream, its explanation, and the device. This is all missing in Jubilees, in which the narrative about Abram's stay in Egypt is only alluded to. The period of his stay in Egypt, however, is the same in 1QapGen and in Jubilees. The building of Zoan ("Tanais" in Jubilees) is missing in 1QapGen.
6.2.2. The Egyptian Adventure

*Jubilees* XIII: 11-15 is a very brief reworking of the Egyptian Adventure, with midrashic insertions. As indicated above, the author of *Jubilees* uses gematria to qualify events in the history of Abram and the world. Taking into account the notion that the number seven is the number of God’s work in and with this world (*B.E.* 1977: 245), it is striking how often this number occurs in Abram’s life. His life is clearly ruled by God. For instance, when Abram is $2 \times 7$ years old, he decides not to worship idols with his father (*Jub.* XI: 16-17); when he is $4 \times 7$ years old he urges his father not to worship idols (*Jub.* XII: 1-5); when Abram is 49 years old he is married to Sarai. This marriage is special due to the number, $7 \times 7$. This means that God is very involved in it. Yet this number is also problematic, for it is the number of a jubilee, the year when the land should be kept barren. Sarai also remains childless for a long time.

In *Jubilees* XIII: 11 gematria can also be found. Abram was eighty years old when he entered Egypt, and that he was eighty-five years old when his wife was taken away from him. Neither the two ages, nor the numbers mentioned by the author can be divided by seven. Consequently, the decisions connected are not from God. Abram makes the first decision, Pharaoh the second.

In *Jubilees* XIII: 10 and 12 it is said, that Abram lived in Hebron for two years at the time when it was being built, and that he lived in Egypt for five years before Sarai was forcibly taken away from him. These seven years mark the moment, when God helps Abram out of trouble. The abduction of Sarai takes place seven years after Abram’s prayer “not to forsake him all the days of his life” (*Jub.* XIII: 9), and in Egypt God shows that He is on Abram’s side. The contents of *Jubilees* follow a fixed sequence of time (see *Jub.* I: 1), consequently, the function of these seven years is also harmonisation with *Numbers* 13: 22b: "Hebron was built seven
years before Zoan in Egypt".
Gen. 12: 14-15 does not state the length of the period, which passed before Sarai was taken away from Abram, but its quick succession of groups of people who were astounded by Sarai's beauty suggests that this period would not have lasted long. In 1QapGen the period of five years in Egypt indicates Sarai's lonesome state, because she was afraid to be seen and consequently, hid herself during her stay in Egypt (1QapGen XIX: 23). Furthermore, it explains that the Egyptians were not as evil as Abram's pesher suggested.
As can be seen above, the author of Jubilees elaborates on Abram's youth and his experiences with God. In this way, the audience learns to know Abram and his relationship with the Lord. In Jub. XII: 18 Abram says to himself that: "all things are in His hand" (Charles 1902: 94), with the result that it is not necessary to observe the stars to know what the weather will be like during the new year. This is merely a conclusion, which can be arrived at about Abram. VanderKam's translation emphasises this feeling of dependence on God: "Everything is under his control" (1989: 71). Abram feels quite at ease in Canaan, which is described floridly (Jub. XIII: 2, 6-7). Abram is grateful, and prays to God: "Thou, the eternal God, art my God". Abram clearly puts his trust in God. Hence, when in Jub. XIII: 10 the famine occurs, the author of Jubilees does not emphasise that it occurred in all the land, as the author of 1QapGen does, for it was clear to the audience that Abram had submitted himself to God, and walked with him all the time (Jub. XII: 19, XIII: 8 and 16). Consequently, it is to be expected, that Abram lived peacefully in Egypt for five years. A strategy to survive in Egypt would be preposterous in the account of Jubilees, for the author has done his best to show the growth of Abram's trust in God. In contrast, both in Genesis and in the Genesis Apocryphon, Abram is still in the process of getting to know God. In
Genesis he is not at ease after taking the initiative to leave the Land, for in doing so he abandons the altars which he built there for God. Hence, he breaks the tie with the God-given point of orientation, ergo with God. This makes him forge a device to stay alive. Fortunately, God cares for Sarai (Gen. 12: 7) and saves the family. In the Apocryphon, it appears as if Abram decides to abandon the promises and to start a better life without his infertile wife in Egypt (3.8. Conclusion: 215.) But God rescues Sarai and forces Abram to accept her, and treat her righteously. Moreover, Abram must return to Canaan and accept God's dominion.

As a result of Abram's intimate relationship with God in Jubilees, Pharaoh's abduction of Sarai appears as a bolt from the blue, although the numbers two and five must have made the audience uneasy, especially since they knew the Genesis account. Consequently, this event is mentioned twice (Jub. XIII: 11-13). The reason for Pharaoh's behaviour could be derived from Jub. XIII: 12, where the great capital of Zoan is built. Pharaoh might have become presumptuous by this great achievement. Ergo, the author of Jub. XIII: 13 portrays Pharaoh as an absolute ruler, who seizes what he wants, even if it (in casu: she) belongs to somebody else. This is especially visible in VanderKam's translation, which I consider better than Charles' for textual-critical reasons (see VanderKam 1989: 77, note 13: 13). VanderKam's reading is: "When the pharaoh took Abram's wife Sarai by force for himself, the Lord punished the pharaoh and his household very severely because of Abram's wife Sarai" (1989: 77). Moreover, the words "for himself" render Genesis better than Charles' translation, for the woman was taken into Pharaoh's house. The difference in the translation of "seized" by Charles and "took by force" by VanderKam is not very great taking into consideration that a seizure can take place by force or suddenly (POD 1970: 759 and Knight 1998:
545). It is interesting, that the expression "by force" is also used in 1QapGen, viz. in XX: 11 (באהות), and in 14 (ברצון).

The formulation of Jubilees XIII: 13 gives the impression that God punished Pharaoh immediately. The text indicates that He did so very severely, thus God stood clearly at the side of "Sarai, Abram’s wife", as verse 13 reads. Genesis does not give an indication of time, but Gen. 12: 17 elucidates that God acted "because of Sarai the wife of Abram". In 1QapGen God punished Pharaoh on the same night, although it is presented as the result of Abram’s prayer. It is also evident that He did so for Sarai’s sake. Hence, the three texts indicate that God considers Abram and Sarai a unity, which must stay together.

The origin of Abram’s riches, which are mentioned in verse 14, is not clear. However, as they stand in a glaring contrast to Pharaoh’s punishment in verse 13, they must be considered a reward, which God gave to Abram. Even Lot, who belongs to Abram’s camp, has property (Jub. XIII: 14). Whether they obtained this property in Egypt is not mentioned, but it is likely, because they stayed there for five years. Genesis 12: 16 relates that Pharaoh did good to Abram for Sarai’s sake and gave the articles mentioned in Jub, XIII: 14; however, the horses which are added in Jubilees, were probably to update the story. In Jubilees the precious metals of Gen. 13: 2 are mentioned, together with those goods. The latter are derived from a different stage of the narrative in Genesis and they do not feature at a later stage of the narrative in Jubilees. Hence, this is a matter of reduction, with the result that the suggestion is made, that Abram gained wealth while Sarai was with Pharaoh. It is not surprising that in the Latin version of Jubilees the word glorificauit occurs, which renders God as the Person, who makes Abram glorious with possessions. Hence, the evildoer, who thinks that he has absolute power is punished severely, whereas the suppressed man of God is blessed.
VanderKam (1989: 77) mentions the Latin version in his note on Jub. XIII: 14. However, since his Ethiopian Vorlage does not supply this information, he translates "Now Abram had an extremely large amount of property" (1989: 77). The fact that Lot is mentioned as a rich person is derived from Gen. 13: 5-6. The order of the mentioned riches in Genesis and in Jubilees differs. In Gen. 12: 16 the male and female slaves are mentioned among the animals. Possibly by means of association the word "female" connects the slaves and the female donkeys with each other. Thereafter, camels are mentioned. In Jub. XIII: 14 the male and female donkeys are not split up and all the animals are placed before the male and female servants. The precious metals are mentioned after the servants. It is possible that the author of Jubilees did not want to place the servants among the animals, because he considered that rude and uncivilised. However, the result of this is that his order, if considered a climax, suggests that precious metals are worth more than slaves. This is very strange in a Jewish context where slaves are considered people, and where God has liberated the Israelites from slavery, with the result that freedom is the norm, not slavery (Ex. 21: 2ff, Dt. 5: 14- 15; 15: 12-18; 23: 15- 16). However, it is acceptable in a Hellenistic context, where slaves were considered "living property" and where Aristotle described the slave as "a living tool" and the tool as "a lifeless slave" (quotes from: Ferguson 1993: 56). Bickerman writes, that:

around 200 B.C.E. the new economic forces and the intensified greed of the period began to destroy the traditional relationship between master and slave and to make the exploitation of slaves not only profitable but acceptable to the public.(1988: 159)

Applebaum writes, that the exploitation of slaves was one of the innovations, which took place in Jerusalem already in the 3rd and 2nd centuries B.C.E. (1989:
32) Furthermore, it must be noted that non-Jewish slaves may indeed be considered property according to Lev. 25: 44- 46.

The author of the Book of Jubilees does not consider it necessary to describe what happens at the Royal Palace. He merely states that Pharaoh returned Sarai to Abram, and that he expelled Abram from Egypt. Abram thanks the Lord for bringing him back in peace (Jub. XIII: 15). God has answered his prayer in Jub. XIII: 9. Hence, Pharaoh's argumentation that Abram is insincere (Gen. 12: 18- 19 and 1QapGen XX: 26- 27) does not occur in Jubilees. On the contrary, when Abram's life is reconsidered, Jubilees XXIII: 10 reads: "Abraham was perfect in all his deeds with the Lord, and well-pleasing in righteousness all the days of his life".

The author of Jubilees does not elaborate on Sarai's abduction, for he is more interested in Abram's growing relationship with God, than in this adventure. Moreover, the fact that Sarai was abducted was problematic, for if she was defiled by Pharaoh she could not be the pure mother of Abram's descendants, and purity is of utmost importance in Jubilees (see 6.2.3. The Brevity of the Egyptian Adventure: 354). That is why he does not describe Pharaoh's character, as is done in the Genesis Apocryphon. There the author presents Pharaoh as an evil power, although a thorough analysis indicates that he is not. In Genesis Pharaoh is presented as a person who is responsible for his act of taking Sarai (₪ נpany in BR 1984: 589: 12). The fact that he did not negotiate with her "brother" Abram to get her as a wife might be the result of his absolute power; he did not have to negotiate, he could just take whom he wanted. Nonetheless, Sarna (1989: 95) tells us, that both in Hebrew and in Egyptian, the word "sister" was used to denote both "sweetheart" and "wife". Hence, Pharaoh should have checked which kind of "sister" Abram meant.
When God's plagues force Pharaoh to return Sarai, Pharaoh merely sends them out of his land, according to *Jubilees*. The material peculiar to 1QapGen XX: 31-32, where Sarai receives compensation from Pharaoh, occurs neither in *Genesis* nor in *Jubilees*.

In *Jubilees* XIII: 15 Abram's return by stages is not emphasised as in *Genesis* 13: 3 and in 1QapGen. However, the passage: "To the place of the altar, with Ai on the east, and Bethel on the west" has an order, which is exactly the opposite of Gen. 12: 8 and Gen. 13: 3- 4 (see also VanderKam 1989: 77, note 13: 15.) A comparison of *Genesis* with 1QapGen and *Jubilees* makes evident why the author of *Jubilees* does not emphasise the return in stages: in *Genesis* and in the *Genesis Apocryphon*. Abram has just experienced an adventure, which has shocked him. In *Genesis* his own behaviour towards Sarai was very irresponsible; in the *Apocryphon* he has lost confidence, because he realises that he has behaved badly, and that he cannot escape God. That is why the pitching of the tent between Bethel and Ai is left out in 1QapGen, whereas the altar is mentioned immediately. Abram tries to soothe God. That is why the name of the place, "House of God", is so important in 1QapGen. Together with the rebuilding of the altar, it suggests Abram's return to God. The contents of Abram's prayer in 1QapGen are derived from *Jubilees* XIII: 15, "who had brought him back וַיֵּשֶׁב...".

In 1QapGen XXI: 7- 10 Abram also doubts whether God will ever give him the promised heir and progeny. On the other hand, in *Jubilees* Abram is full of confidence, for he is close to God. Abram's return to his first place of sojourn in the Promised Land, and his act of blessing God also indicates his gratitude and his acknowledgement of the fact that God had shown his care for Abram. That is why the fact that Abram invoked the name of the Lord (Gen. 13: 4) is expanded with "who had brought him back in peace" in Jub. XIII: 15). If Jub. XIII: 15 and 16
refer to the same event, Abram also sacrifices to the Lord there. Compared to 
*Genesis*, Jub. XIII: 16 seems to be a midrashic insertion with the aims: to fit the 
event in the calendar of jubilees, and to emphasise his commitment to the 
covenant with God (see also Halpern- Amaru 1994a: 33).
Hereafter, the story about Lot’s departure is related.

6.2.3. The Brevity of the Egyptian Adventure in Jubilees

The description of *Jubilees* above shows that the author elaborates largely on the 
growing relationship between God and Abram. In this elaboration he pays extra 
attention to Abram’s youth and Haran’s death. On the other hand, he renders the 
Adventure in Egypt very briefly. This matter is discussed here.
The function of the elaborations is to show Abram’s zeal for God, but also, when 
he asks God whether he should return to Ur in Jub.XII: 21, to show that Abram 
has thought about his behaviour and its effects. From the moment of Abram’s 
calling in Jub. XII: 22, Abram is clearly getting closer to God. He learns Hebrew, 
and wishes to journey to Canaan. In Jub. XIII: 2 Abram sees how beautiful the 
land south of Haran is and when God promises this land to him and his seed, he 
sacrifices to God out of gratitude. From Jub. XIII: 5 on, he explores the Land, and 
blesses God for leading him away from Ur of the Chaldees, and for bringing him 
to Canaan. He offers a second sacrifice on Rosh haShana, the first day of a series 
of ten days on which one reconsiders one’s life with God (Jub. XIII: 8). Abram 
realises that it is thanks to God that there is water in Canaan and he asks Him 
never to forsake him. After a stay of two more years in Canaan a famine occurs, 
which induces Abram to journey to Egypt in the third year of the first week (of the 
This journey is Abram’s decision as the gematria (two years) indicates. Yet this
decision is not considered negative, for the relationship between God and Abram has grown very strong. Jub. XIII: 8: "Thou, the eternal God, art my God". Since Abram had asked God not to forsake him all the days of his life (Jub. XIII: 9), it is not surprising that Abram and Sarai lived peacefully in Egypt for five years. Also, when Pharaoh seizes Sarai, God intervenes and saves her. God's rescue takes place exactly seven years after Abram’s prayer not to forsake him. It is an illustration of the above-mentioned good relationship. Moreover, God makes Abram and Lot rich. When Sarai has been returned to Abram, they go back to the altar between Ai and Bethel, where Abram blesses the Lord (Jub. XIII: 15). In Jub. XIII: 16 Abram returns to the altar to sacrifice to God in the third year of the first week of the forty-first jubilee, which is seven years after his journey to Egypt. Hence, Abram commemorates his leaving the country and shows thereby that he is glad to be in the Land, which God destined to him and his progeny. Hence, Abram merely left the Promised Land to survive and returned safe home with God’s help. His journey to Egypt was not problematic due to his good relationship with God, and he did not plan a device to survive there because he trusted that God would be with him always. Consequently, the Adventure in Egypt functions as an illustration of God’s faithfulness to a faithful believer, Abram. On the other hand, the activities of people who try to thwart God and his plans are nullified, in casu Pharaoh. Why the author of Jubilees did not elaborate on the Egyptian Adventure is now clear. The reasons are as follows:

- He used the Egyptian Adventure as an illustration of the good relationship between God and Abram. Therefore, an elaboration on Abram’s plan to survive would be preposterous.
• He used it to indicate that God does not allow humans to thwart his plans. If Pharaoh had kept Sarai, there would have been no progeny and the new beginning with humanity would have been thwarted.

• Sarai’s abduction must have been problematic to the author, who was very interested in purity and pure descent, e.g., Halpern- Amaru has shown that the author of Jubilees used Abram's marriage to his paternal sister to indicate his return to genealogical purity (1994: 622). Hence, both the author and his audience must have felt uneasy about the purity of Sarai's offspring after her stay in Pharaoh's house. This explains why the author does not want to dwell on Sarai's stay there. The precise indication as to when events took place helps him indicate that Isaac is certainly Abram's legitimate child with Sarai, for after more than ten years after the Egyptian adventure Isaac is born. Abram and Sarai returned from Egypt in 1963 AM (Jub. XIII: 16), and according to Jub. XVI: 15-16 Sarai fell pregnant with Isaac in 1976 AM (according to Charles 1902: 115, note 15), or in 1987 AM (according to VanderKam 1989: 97; the two scholars indicate that there are problems with the chronology in the text).

• The author wants to set Abram as an example for his people in Hellenistic times. Jub. XXIII: 10 ends the narrative about Abraham as follows: "Abraham was perfect in all his deeds with the Lord and well-pleasing in righteousness all the days of his life" That is why he does not even hint at Abram's behaviour towards Sarai as it is depicted in Gen. 12: 11-13.

6.3. Analysis of Jubilees

6.3.1. The Absence of a Concentric Shape

In Chapters II and III it is noted that the passage under study has a concentric shape both in Genesis and in the Genesis Apocryphon. However, a quick glance
at the *Book of Jubilees* immediately reveals that in this book the pericope has no concentric shape.

In *Jubilees* the Egyptian Adventure is merely an intercession of Abram's stay in Canaan. Abram enjoys living in the Promised Land, and blesses the Lord for leading him out of Ur, towards Canaan. Abram acknowledges God's goodness and greatness in Canaan (Jub. XIII: 8), and in the following verse, the author indicates Abram's dependence on God by mentioning his wish that the Lord should be with Abram and never forsake him.

By writing about forsakenness the author creates sequence in the narrative, for it seems as if God's faithfulness or power on strange territory will be the issue of the next event and then the author introduces his audience to the adventure in Egypt. In Jub. XIII: 11 the author mentions Sarai's abduction immediately after Abram's stay in Egypt. The only elaboration he permits about Egypt is mentioning the building of Tanais (Zoan in 1QapGen), which is useful for his chronology and as a description of Pharaoh's presumption. He does not elaborate on Egypt's abundance of water or its fertility, as he did when writing about Canaan in XIII: 6. Egypt is clearly not the subject of the adventure, and even less is it Abram's destination.

Hereafter, the author sums up very briefly the Egyptian Adventure without any actions for which Abram could be blamed. On the other hand, he depicts God as Abram's mighty Protector and in Jub. XIII: 16c he makes Abram sum up the conclusion of his adventure: "Thou, the most high God, art my God for ever and ever". Hence, God indeed does not forsake Abram. Even in Egypt He is powerful. God is the highest god of all.

Hence, the author has reshaped existing puzzling material in such a way, that it has become an incident, indicating God's faithfulness on Abram's journey with
Him. In *Jubilees* XIII: 15 Abram does not rebuild the altar, neither does he sacrifice on it. He merely blesses God for bringing him back in peace. This indicates that Abram does not start anew, as in the *Apocryphon*. His relationship with God has been good all the way.

6.3.2. Abram's Character in Jubilees.

Throughout the *Book of Jubilees* the author describes Abram as an intelligent person who wonders why everything is the way it is. That is why he researches, and explores everything around him with a critical attitude. He also does introspection, and realises that it is due to his arson that his foolish brother has died. He feels responsible and unhappy about this and the fact that he is prepared to go back to Ur (Jub. XII: 21), indicates his sense of responsibility and justice. His sense of responsibility can also be discerned in his act of settling at a place, not far away from Lot, when he has left Abram's house. Abram wants to be around when needed (Jub. XIV). Abram does not run away from problems, rather, wants to solve them.

He also changes his attitude when he has learnt that something is not right. He stops his practice of stargazing when he has arrived at the conclusion that God has everything in His hands, as can be derived from Jub. XIV: 1-4, where it is said that Abram dreamt in the night of the new moon, instead of watching the stars. His critical attitude is also visible when he argues with God that it is no use being blessed with riches if a slave must inherit them, since he has no heir (Jub. XIV: 2).

The author bases Abram's attitude towards Lot upon his sense of responsibility towards him after Lot's father burnt to death in a fire, which Abram had lit. The author indicates that Abram tried to rear Lot to be a good person. However, he
depicts Abram with more criticism towards his own descendants, e.g. Abram has clearly given up hope that Esau would ever be able to provide the progeny needed for God's plan, whereas Jacob seems to be the one in whom "his name and seed be called" (Jub. XIX: 16). Subsequently, Abram commends Jacob to Rebecca, who also preferred Jacob, and blesses Jacob. Hereafter, Esau hardly plays any role in the narrative anymore, which shows that the author takes no interest in him, nor should his audience.

6.3.3 The Presentation of the Egyptian Adventure in the Three Versions

The Egyptian Adventure in Genesis

The conclusion derived from the Genesis version was that according to the author Abram was the one who was responsible for his departure from the Promised Land. He fled out of fear of nature. The structure of Gen. 12: 10b indicates that Abram even intended to settle in Egypt. The author also made Abram forge the device to save his own skin. Neither a kidnapping, nor Sarai's destiny were catered for in the device.

Then the author uses contrast: while Pharaoh gave Abram presents with the result that Abram grew rich, God intervened in verse 17 "because of Sarai the wife of Abram". The plot unravelled, Pharaoh denied guilt, although his role was presented as very doubtful, and Sarai and Abram were escorted to the Promised Land.

There, at the place where Abram had made his first altar, the author made Abram re-establish his relationship with the Lord, upon whom he would rely ever after.

Halpern- Amaru writes that Rebecca is related to Isaac through her grandparents. Hence, her lineage is known, which explains why she is depicted as a matriarch in Jubilees and why she serves "as the paradigmatic model for purity of ancestry" in
The Egyptian Adventure in the Genesis Apocryphon

The conclusion of Chapter IV shows that at first glance, the author of 1QapGen sought to free Abram of the blame for his journey to Egypt. He also sought to shift the blame for Abram's lie to God, the Giver of dreams. However, in 3.8. Conclusion: 214-217 it is shown that Abram purposefully alienated himself from God, when His promises did not work out the way he expected.

Sarai, whom he passed over to Pharaoh was restored in her right and dignity and received compensation for all she had to endure.

In the end Abram had to submit himself to God, and accept God's conditions, viz. to take back his infertile wife, and accept the land, which was dependent on rainfall, thus on God. He renewed his relationship with God by retracing his steps and by rebuilding the altar. His prayer functions as a summary of what Abram has learnt about God in this adventure. It also shows that Abram was not happy that Sarai was returned to him for he did not thank God for getting her back.

The Egyptian Adventure in the Book of Jubilees

The author of Jubilees indicates that it was Abram's initiative to leave the Promised Land in order to travel to Egypt. This initiative stands in a context of a growing relationship between God and Abram. This relationship had become so good and Abram is so fond of Canaan (Jub. XIII: 6-7), that it is not at all problematic that Abram leaves the Promised Land. Moreover, Jub. XIII: 16 indicates that Abram left the Land temporarily. His trust in the Lord is clear from the fact that he does not plan a device to survive in Egypt. Consequently, the precarious situation in which Abram brought his wife in the other two versions

does not occur in *Jubilees*. The narrator alludes to God’s good relationship with Abram when Sarai is abducted, for He saves her. Hence, Abram’s trust is rewarded. After these events, Abram continued his relationship with God in the Promised Land.

### 6.3.4. The Dependence of the Genesis Apocryphon from Jubilees

The scholars alluded to in 1.3.4. The Date of 1QapGen: 25-26 arrived at more or less the same conclusion concerning the date when the text of 1QapGen emerged; viz. the late first century B.C.E., or the first half of the first century C.E. In the present Chapter VanderKam is quoted estimating a date for the emergence of the Book of Jubilees between 170 and 140 B.C.E. (1992a: 1030). The findings of these experts lead to the conclusion that the *Genesis Apocryphon* is younger than *Jubilees*, which is the basis of my argumentation henceforth.

### 6.3.5. 1QapGen's presentation of Abram

The author of *Jubilees* has very successfully solved the question of Abram’s departure from the Promised Land and the question of his ill behaviour towards Sarai. It seems strange that the author of the Genesis Apocryphon did not make use of this solution. However, the purpose of 1QapGen is not to whitewash Abram’s reputation, although that is suggested by its format, but to admonish the Jews to remain faithful to Judaism, in spite of the fact that the adherence to the Hellenistic way of life offered them great prosperity.

### 6.3.6. The Apocryphon's indebtedness to Jubilees

If the *Genesis Apocryphon* is younger than *Jubilees* it could have borrowed material from the latter. Below similarities in the two rewritten Bible books are
supplied and discussed and a conclusion is drawn as to whether the *Apocryphon* is indebted to *Jubilees*, or not.

The author of 1QapGen uses material, which occurs in *Jubilees*, but which does not occur in *Genesis*:

- In column XII: 16-17 the idea of sacrifice could be derived from *Jubilees*, for it does not occur in the parallel *Genesis* text.
- Column XVI is derived from Jub. VIII: 1ff. This division of land amongst Noah's children does not occur in *Genesis*.
- Column XVII corresponds with Jub. IX: 2 ff. This division of land amongst Noah's grandchildren does not occur in *Genesis*.
- Column XIX: 7-8 resemble Jub. XIII: 8-9 (Thanksgiving and sacrifice when Abram has entered Canaan. However, this must be left out of consideration, since *Jubilees* may have been used there to restore the text of the *Apocryphon* (see 6.2.1. *Abram in Jubilees*: 341).
- Column XIX: 9-11 resemble Jub. XIII: 10-11. Abram's two-year stay in Hebron, and his journey to Egypt due to famine. His stay in Hebron in the two rewritten Bible texts is an addition to the text of *Genesis* (however, this is also a reconstructed text).
- The building of Zoan, 7 years after Hebron, is added in Jub. XIII: 12 and the name Zoan is also mentioned in 1QapGen XIX: 22 and 24. These are additions in comparison with *Genesis*.
- An interpretation of *Genesis* in Jub XIII: 15 "who had brought him back in peace" is referred to in 1QapGen XXI: 3-4, "...because He had brought me back to this land in safety (literally: peace)"
• Jub. XIII: 16 "most high God...for ever and ever" is reflected in 1QapGen XXI: 2 "God Most High...Lord of the ages"

• 1QapGen XXI: 7, "it grieved me that Lot, the son of my brother, had parted from me", corresponds with Jub. XIII: 18, "it grieved him in his heart that his brother's son had parted from him; for he had no children". This grief is neither mentioned nor to be expected in the Genesis account for in Gen. 13: 9 it was Abram, who suggested to Lot to part ways.

Taking into consideration the prevalent view that 1QapGen was written after the Book of Jubilees, these similarities possibly indicate that Jubilees was one of the Vorlagen to the Genesis Apocryphon, or that the Genesis Apocryphon borrows from the Jubilees tradition. However, it is also possible that the two books stood in the same tradition and borrowed from a similar set of ideas, circulating around the same pericopes of the Bible, as Vermes shows in connection with Sefer ha-Yashar (1961: 95). Sefer ha-Yashar dates back to the Middle Ages, but Vermes has shown that it has preserved very ancient traditions. Jacobs (1995: 139-142) holds that the tree imagery in the Genesis Apocryphon was a known tradition, because the proem of a midrashic commentary about Abram's sojourn in Egypt in Genesis Rabbah, chapter 41, mentions Gen. 12: 17 and Psalm 92: 13. Since there is not even a hint at the connection between those texts, he concludes that the tradition of the tree imagery in the Genesis Apocryphon must have been known. Taking into account the fact, that the Apocryphon often does not quote Jubilees verbatim, it is most probable that passages from Jubilees were quoted by heart in 1QapGen or that Jubilees and 1QapGen borrow from the same sources.

Since the author of 1QapGen has a different purpose from that of Jubilees, he does not make use of the solution to the problem of Abram leaving the Promised
Land, which *Jubilees* provides. Other factors to be considered are the weaknesses of *Jubilees*:

- Abram's behaviour is too good to be true, he is unnatural in *Jubilees* (e.g. XI: 16-24: a 14-year old lad decides not to worship idols with his father on his own account; he is consulted to chase away ravens, and as a 15-year old lad he instructs plough-makers! He "was perfect in all his deeds with the Lord" in XXIII: 10. Abram's negligence of Esau and his choice in favour of his worthy descendant Jacob in XIX: 15ff. He also commanded the "judgement of Abraham" to his descendants in XLI: 28).

The author of the *Genesis Apocryphon* pictures Abram as a very egocentric person, who does everything for his own profit and who does not care what happens to people dependent on him. He strives for his own gain.

- The author of *Jubilees* emphasises Abram's good relationship with the Lord (see 6.2.3. The Brevity of the Egyptian Adventure: 353), whereas the author of the *Apocryphon* shows that Abram's attempts to improve his own life on the cost of others is to no avail. God interferes and Abram has to start all over again in the same dry country with the same infertile wife. Moreover, the author admonishes his people to remain faithful to their ancestral background and to God, whom they cannot evade anyway (see 3.7. Analysis of the Narrative: 213). In *Jubilees*, the ancestral tradition is also considered authoritative and worthy of imitation. See e.g. Jub. XII: 27, where Abram begins to study their Hebrew books; Enoch's behaviour, worthy to be imitated is described in Jub. IV: 16-25; and the Feast of Weeks was celebrated by the great ancestors and should also be observed by the children of Israel "in all their generations" as Jub. VI: 20 reads. However, Abram breaks away from the idolatrous practices of his ancestors. The emphasis on the importance of being
faithful to the Lord penetrates the whole *Book of Jubilees*. In *Jubilees* Abram is an individualist who thinks independent from his community (e.g. XI: 16-17; 23; XII: 2-5; 16-20; 27), but he adheres to God. The author of the *Apocryphon* emphasises that individualism without adherence to God is egocentrism, which leads to injustice. Therefore, he emphasised that God does not condone injustice, but that He gives another chance to a trespasser.

6.3.7. Conclusion Concerning Jubilees

The author of the *Apocryphon* had very good reasons to deviate from *Jubilees*. He lived in other times in which individualism had increased. It was no longer taken for granted that people would live according the tradition transmitted by the parents. Hellenism offered great, new insights and possibilities, which were very attractive. It was likely that some people would favour the grandeur and opportunities of Hellenism to Judaism with its emphasis on justice and righteousness. Therefore, the author of 1QapGen decided to rewrite the Adventure in Egypt without xenophobia, the Egyptians were not as evil as Abram expected them to be, but with a clear moral lesson: injustice is the result of forgetting God and His commandments. God will take sides with the oppressed and will restore justice. The trespassing individualist gets a chance to start anew, if he/she is prepared to observe God's commandments.

6.4. The Pericope in *Jewish Antiquities*

On page 324, Halpern- Amar’s remark can be found that Flavius Josephus has also rewritten the Bible in his *Antiquities*, albeit primarily for a gentile audience.

---

116 Ferguson (1993: 14) writes, that “the breaking of traditional patterns of inherited conduct in the enlarged world of the Hellenistic age threw people back upon themselves and gave opportunity for individual expression. Chosen things became more important than inherited things.”
It is likely, that his *Antiquities*, published in 93/4 C.E. (Rajak 1983: 237) was their first encounter with the biblical tradition. Below, attention will be paid as to how Josephus’ rewriting differs from the account of the *Genesis Apocryphon*. The pericope under study can be found in *Jewish Antiquities* I:vii-viii. The edition used is the one of Thackeray (1930: 75-85).

Chapter vii: 1 begins with the statement that Abram “adopted Lot, his brother Aran’s son and the brother of his wife Sarra”, because he had no legitimate son. Hence, Lot is presented as Abram’s heir. Abram was very intelligent and while he was living in Chaldaea, he developed a monotheistic doctrine. He stated that nobody can achieve anything good for the welfare of humankind except by God’s command, “and not in virtue of his own inherent power” (Thackeray 1930: 77). This statement was based upon his observance of the heavenly bodies, which betray irregularities and consequently do not have power to control themselves. Therefore, there must be a greater Power, who regulates everything. This is the One God, who is the only One to be worshipped (*Antiquities* I: vii. 1).

This doctrine made him unpopular with the Chaldees and the other nations living in Mesopotamia. Consequently, when God commanded him to emigrate to Canaan, Abram considered this the best option, μετοικεῖν δοκιμάσας. Hence, when he was 75 years old, he settled, κατῴκησε, in Canaan, at the command of God, τοῦ θεοῦ κελεύσαντος (Antt. I: vii. 1). It is evident that there is no speech of a calling. Abram merely acts according to God’s will after he has approved of it. Hence, Abram is presented as a person, who examines everything carefully before he concludes or acts. Even what God wants him to do is thought over, before he acts.

117 Josephus does not make reference to the cause of Haran’s death. In the previous chapter Josephus had already explained the family relationships, which follow the
Josephus also elucidates that Abram settled in Canaan, κατοικήσε (I: vii. 1). Consequently, he intended to live there, as in Jubilees, but in contrast to Genesis\textsuperscript{118} and the Genesis Apocryphon. He confirms this by building an altar, on which he sacrifices to God (Antt. I: vii. 1). In contrast to Genesis (12: 7-8) and Jubilees (XIII: 4 and 8) Abram builds an altar only once in Antiquities.

The rest of Antiquities I: vii is filled with references to other authors who have written about Abram’s greatness.\textsuperscript{119}

Chapter viii begins with the famine in Canaan. Again, Abram acts intelligently, i.e. after an examination of the situation. After he has heard of the prosperity of the Egyptians, he wants to go away, μεταίρειν (Antt. viii. 1) to them for two reasons:

- To profit by their abundance, ἀφθονία
- To study their religion in order to find out whether he could learn from it, or whether it was inferior to his doctrine.

Hence, Josephus does not allude to Abram’s will to stay in Egypt. He indicates merely that Abram wanted to survive there and in the meantime study Egypt’s religion, in contrast to Genesis and the Genesis Apocryphon. Moreover, in Antt. I: viii. 3 Josephus alludes to Abram’s return to Canaan as if that were the only thing to be expected, 'Ως δ’ εἰς τὴν Χαναναίαν ἀφίκετο... The use of the word ἀφθονία is striking, for it suggests the same as the frequent use of μακροθυμία in the Genesis Apocryphon. Abram’s intellectual attitude is illustrated by the fact that he even considered the option to abandon his doctrine, should the doctrine of the Egyptians prove to be superior, ἵ γὰρ κρείσσοσιν εὑρεθείσι κατακολούθησειν.

\textsuperscript{118} Rabbinical tradition according to Thackeray (1930: 75).

\textsuperscript{119} See my discussion on page 52.

However, Schwartz (1990: 55) writes that Josephus “felt constrained to use the Bible itself almost exclusively” in Jewish Antiquities Book I-XI. Feldman writes that hardly any systematic study of Josephus’ biblical source has been made, but that his source was likely the LXX, or a Hebrew text which is different from ours (1989: 20-22).
Of course, Abram took Sarai with him on his way to Egypt. Due to his fear for the Egyptians' frenzy for beautiful women, he devised the plan to pass his wife as his sister in order to save his life. He instructed Sarai to co-operate. The account does not reveal whether she did so. However, what Abram expected happened. Sarai's beauty was "noised abroad" (Thackeray 1930: 81), with the result that Pharaoh heard about it and wished to see this prodigy, and take hold of her, ἀφασθαί; ἀπτω aor. mid. is used for intercourse with a woman (Arndt & Gingrich 1979: 102b). This is in accord with the autocratic rule by the Pharaohs in the Hellenistic era (Hadas 1959: 24). "But God thwarted his criminal passion by an outbreak of disease and political disturbance" (Thackeray 1930: 81), and Pharaoh's priests explained the cause of the calamities. It was the wrath of God for Pharaoh's misbehaviour, ἱππίοις, towards Abram's wife. Hence, in accord with Genesis, the Apocryphon and Jubilees, Flavius Josephus states that God acted on behalf of Sarai, but he does not blame Abram for Sarai's fate as the Apocryphon does. The character of the disease is not explained by Josephus, and the political disturbance is an addition in comparison with Genesis, the Apocryphon and Jubilees.

Pharaoh was terrified, φοβηθέεις. The verb φοβέω is also used in the LXX and in the New Testament denoting the fear of God (Brown 1975: 622-623; AG 1979: 862-863). It was to be expected that Pharaoh would be terrified, for he had mistreated, ἱππίοις Sarai. By doing so he suggested that her God was not capable to act on behalf of her. He had insulted her God and had committed hybris!

Pharaoh had to know more about Sarai and the man "she had brought with her" (Thackeray 1930: 83). The words "she had brought with her" are interesting, for they illustrate that Sarai was not abducted. On the contrary, she was escorted by

---

120 Henceforth AG.
Abram and he stayed with her during the period when she was in the Palace. This would be in agreement with the account in 1QapGen XX: 8-10, where the author writes, that “he sent off in haste (and) had her brought”, after which Abram started his negotiations with Pharaoh. It is not known from which source Josephus gets this material (see footnote 119), but it is possible that the author of the Apocryphon used the same source. If he did so, Abram was in the Palace during the whole period that Sarai was there, for that is implied in Josephus’ account. Sarai told Pharaoh the truth, and he made his excuses to Abram, saying that he was under the impression that she was his sister, not his wife, and that he had intended to be properly married to her, and not to insult or outrage her, ἐνυφρισαί, “in a transport of passion” (Thackeray 1930: 83).

In the Genesis Apocryphon (XX: 31-32) Sarai is compensated for her trouble in the Palace, but Josephus writes that Pharaoh gave Abram abundant riches (Antt.I: viii: 1). In Gen.12: 16 Pharaoh enriches Abram after he took Sarai to his palace, but it is not written that he gave compensation after he sent the couple back to Canaan. In Jubilees Abram is not compensated by Pharaoh. Pharaoh merely sends him out of Egypt (Jub. XIII: 15). The riches, that Abram has, are mentioned in contrast to the plagues, which Pharaoh has to endure (Jub. XIII: 13-14). Consequently, the author of Jubilees suggests that God gave them to Abram (see 6.6.6. The Egyptian Adventure: 348). Hence, Flavius Josephus had another source from which he deduced this compensation, which could be the biblical tradition that he used, or his own elaboration. He could also have written this in accord with the practice in Hellenistic environment. According to the Law of the Roman Republic a woman could be brought under the power (manus) of her husband by:

confarreatio (a religious ceremony and the most solemn and elaborate form), coemptio (a sale of the woman to her husband), and usus (living
together uninterruptedly in the man’s house for one year). There was also marriage without manus, based on mutual consent. In this case the woman remained a part of her father’s family instead of entering the husband’s. (Ferguson 1993: 54)

According to Antt. I: vi. 5 Lot, Sarai and Milka were the children of Haran, Abram’s brother. Due to the fact that Sarai’s father (Haran) had died, and that her brother Lot was adopted by Abram, it may be inferred that she was in any case dependent on Abram, either since Abram was the adoptive father of her brother (who was responsible for her in case she had remained a part of her father’s family), or on the grounds of usus. Hence, the compensation to Abram could be based upon two systems of law.

After this event, Abram and Sarai remained in Egypt, where the fame of Abram’s wisdom spread. By his intelligence and rhetoric he demonstrated that the views of the Egyptians “were idle and contained nothing true” (Thackeray 1930: 83). Hence, there was no reason to exchange his views by an Egyptian doctrine. Instead of learning from the Egyptians, he taught them arithmetic and astronomy. This indicates the more that Abram was a great figure.

At a certain moment, probably when the famine is over, Abram returns to Canaan. He is back in the land he never intended to leave.

6.4.1. Conclusion Concerning Antiquities

The following findings correspond with those in 2.8:

- Similar to Gen. 12: 1 the divine self-disclosure is unclear in Antiquities (I: vii: 1).

- The journey to Egypt is undertaken on Abram’s own account, although it is only a visit during the famine (I: viii: 1). He intended to return to Canaan, the
land to which God had sent him. This differs from *Genesis* and the *Apocryphon*.

- The wife-sister type-scene is ascribed to Abram (I: viii: 1). It is not clear how Abram invented this device, neither does Josephus state whether Sarai ever said that Abram was her brother.

- No attention is paid to the fact that Abram was ready to sacrifice his wife in order to stay alive (I: viii: 1). It is suggested that God was on Abram’s side, and that this is the reason why he never feared that his device would fail. This seems to be a weakness in the story, for the reader wonders why Abram should forge a device, if God is with him all the way. On the other hand, the author writes for an audience, which worships fickle gods.

- Sarai’s fate is completely played down (I: viii: 1). It is only a small event in Egypt, for Abram’s wisdom draws all the attention. Sarai does not speak a single word in the narrative; her words are rendered in indirect speech.

- Pharaoh is a passionate, autocratic ruler (I: viii: 1). Thanks to his terror (fear of God) Abram and Sarai can continue their stay in Egypt during the famine in Canaan.

- Abram’s prosperity comes from Pharaoh and the abundance in Egypt (I: viii: 1).

- Lot was to be Abram’s heir (I: vii: 1).

Since Josephus’ audience consisted especially of Hellenised Romans and Greeks in Rome and abroad, he wrote for a pagan audience. After he had proved to be useful for imperial propaganda in favour of Vespasian and Titus, he also enjoyed the favour of Domitian. Hence, his situation was stable. He was a wealthy person, possessing estates in Palestine, with the result that he had the opportunity to write
works in accord with his own interest. In the early eighties he decided to focus on the defense of Judaism (Schwartz 1990: 16-17). Jewish Antiquities, published in 93/94 is one of the apologies he wrote.

In the pericope under study he introduces Abram as a great ancestor of the Jews, who founded the doctrine which the Jews followed ever since. Abram is very intelligent, and prevails in his knowledge and wisdom over the Egyptians. The Egyptians learn arithmetic and astronomy from Abram, which they, in their turn, transmit to the Greeks (I: viii: 2). Hence, Hellenism owes part of its greatness to Abram.

In the pericope, Abram’s relationship with God is idealised, and Abram is presented as someone who voluntarily worships God after he has examined the heavenly bodies and has concluded that they are subjected to God.

The inducement to Abram’s journey to Egypt is a famine, but he seizes the opportunity to test the doctrine of the Egyptians in order to find out whether he could learn from them. However, he is much wiser than they and God is much stronger than the Egyptian deities. Hence, probably when the famine is over, Abram returns to Canaan, the land in which he wanted to live anyway.

Hence, his journey to Egypt was on his own account, but with the presupposition that he would return to Canaan. His journey was also purposeful, for he learnt that his God was more powerful than those of Egypt. Moreover, he found out that he was on the right track with his doctrine. Since there is no allusion to a calling by God, nor to promises which Abram could abandon, Abram’s reputation is totally clear.
7. CONCLUSION OF THIS DISSERTATION

7.1. The Date

The *Genesis Apocryphon* is one of the Dead Sea Scrolls from Cave I, which were found by Bedouins in the winter of 1946-1947. On the grounds of palaeographical research and accelerator mass spectrometry the scroll is considered to date back to the first century B.C.E. or the first century C.E. On the grounds of the Aramaic, which the scroll contains, Kutscher concluded that the narrative was written in the first century B.C.E.

7.2. The Author(s)

Not much is known about the origin of the *Genesis Apocryphon*. It is not known who wrote the narrative, whether one or more authors wrote it or to which group of the population they belonged, whether they were male, female, or a mixed group. I have chosen to speak of "the narrator", or "the author", and sometimes of "he", although the author shows great interest in the fact that justice be done to Sarai, which might indicate that a woman was involved in the writing. Instances, where God acts justly to her are the following: in XX: 16-17 God immediately sends an evil spirit to protect Sarai. He does much more than what Abram asked Him to do, "May he not have power to defile my wife from me tonight"; He protects her during her whole stay in Pharaoh's Palace, which lasted more than two years (XX: 18). Moreover, at the end of the adventure (XXI: 31), it is Sarai who is compensated, not Abram.

It is difficult to discern whether the narrative was written by a male, or a female author. It could be argued that a woman would have given Sarai a say in the narrative, for instance, when it comes to the explanation of the dream, her fear of Zoan, or her lie to protect Abram. However, I have indicated in 3.7. *Analysis of*
the Narrative: 185), that it is the author's approach to present Abram's side of the story and consequently, to play down Sarai's importance. Therefore, it was impossible to let the woman explain the dream conform the convention, for this would change the narrative completely. Moreover, it was important that the audience would realise by means of the disregard of this convention that the story does not tally. Elaborations on her fear in Zoan could also put a spoke in the wheel. Sarai's quick interpolation in XX: 10, אנה ירה, when she tried to save Abram's life does not lend itself to give her a chance to speak out either, for it is probably invented by the author, as I have observed in 3.9. The Purpose of the Narrative: 218. Also the fact that Sarai is not even mentioned at the end of the adventure (column XX: 33 till XXI: 4), is part of the author's device: all the strange turns in the narrative are hints to look for the real story. Hägg writes that it is possible that there were women among the Hellenistic authors, but that it remains an unproven thesis (1983: 96). With the Genesis Apocryphon this is also the case. It could be argued that any person with knowledge of Hellenistic literary devices could have written this narrative. The only other prerequisite was that this person felt sorry for the powerless in society, in 1QapGen: the woman Sarai and the orphan Lot, whose situation became worse due to the individualism, which increased as a result of the choices people had to make in life after Hellenism had become influential in Judaea (see 6.3.7. Conclusion Concerning Jubilees: 363, footnote 116). It was no longer certain that a person would follow the Judaic traditions of old, for it had become possible to (partly) adjust to Hellenism, which could help to get on in the world. By making such a choice, the individual could get alienated from the principles of justice and righteousness of Judaism. This is the problem with which the author wanted to deal.
7.3. The Origins of the Community and the Scrolls

The prevailing opinion amongst scholars is still, that the community living in Qumran was Essene. Taking into account the fact that the Apocryphon is saturated with Hellenistic traits and characteristics of Hellenistic literature (see 4.2. Hellenistic Influences on 1QapGen: 244), and that its purpose is to bring Hellenistic Jews back under the yoke of Torah and that the ancestor Abram is depicted as a person abandoning God, it is not very likely that the author of the Genesis Apocryphon was an Essene. It was too worldly due to the Hellenistic influences. Moreover, intermarriage is not presented as a problem in XX: 34, and Abram's behaviour is very different from the pious ways of the Essenes. Moreover, I did not discern evident Essene phenomena in the text. On the contrary, at a place where the author could have inserted Essene ideas, he did not do that (see 3.5. Text-critical and Philological notes, Column XX: 148). Moreover, Fitzmyer has indicated in his commentary that Abram's imposition of hands on Pharaoh's head is probably not of Essene origin. Furthermore, it seems as if the community did not consider the scroll worth while copying, since only one copy of the scroll is found in Qumran. The 8 fragments (siglum 1Q20), which Milik has published probably belong to the same scroll and must have preceded the extant columns.

Thus the question arises how this scroll arrived in Qumran's book collection. Golb's suggestion is that the contents of the libraries and book collections from Jerusalem were deposited in Qumran in an attempt to save them when the Romans lay siege on Jerusalem. This is an interesting idea, but I think that it would have been impossible to transport such a number of books without being seen, even if Golb would be right that it took the Romans much time to lay siege around all of Jerusalem, and even if the books were transported via hidden routes and wadies.
It is more likely, that the community of Qumran had both collected and written books, of which they copied the books, which were of interest to them. It must be noted that several books contain the same handwriting; consequently, they were copied by the same scribe. The books of interest to the community of Qumran were the books of what is now called the Hebrew Bible, the books which reveal ideas similar to those of the community, and books written by the community. The *Genesis Apocryphon* must have belonged to the collected books, which proved to be of no particular value to the community. Consequently, it was not copied, but wrapped in linen and deposited.

In publications about Qumran the word *scriptorium* occurs very often. Since that term is derived from the practice of copying manuscripts in medieval monasteries, and since it is to be doubted whether the community of Qumran functioned as such, I am reluctant to use that suggestive term.

### 7.4. The Purpose of the Narrative

According to Kutscher, the language of the scroll reflects the Aramaic of Judaea of the first century B.C.E. In this century the Hasmonaeans Alexander Jannaeus, Queen Salomé and her sons ruled over Judaea. They favoured the Graeco-Roman culture and the Hasmonaean kings were involved in power struggles. They inherited many institutions from the Hellenistic governments, which ruled before them, with the result that their administration was similar to that of the Hellenists (Applebaum 1989: 38-39). Hellenism was also very attractive to the Jews of the time because it offered great possibilities to climb the social ladder. It is likely that the *Genesis Apocryphon* was written to admonish Jews to remain a pure nation as Fröhlich has shown with regard to the ancestry of Noah and Isaac. From the pericope under study it can be deduced that it was the author’s purpose to admonish the Jews to follow their calling as a chosen nation and to adhere to their
own God and tradition. Only if they do so, they will be righteous and worthy of inheriting land. In case they would forget about God like Abram did, He would not forget them and lead them back on their tracks. Thus, the author tried to convince his audience to remain faithful to the Lord, or to return to Him.

7.5. The Genre of the *Genesis Apocryphon*

1QapGen belongs to the genre of Rewritten Bible, for its author not only updates the narratives concerning Noah and Abram and because he not only tries to solve problems occurring in the *Genesis* version, but since he also retells the narrative in a very attractive way. The result is that material of the *Genesis* parallel has been left out and that material from elsewhere in the *Genesis* tradition and outside this tradition has been inserted. Nonetheless, the author of the *Genesis Apocryphon* renders more or less faithfully the order of events in the texts of the Bible- book, which were chosen to rewrite, with Noah and Abram/Sarai as the heroes.

7.6. The Compilation of the Narrative

The Chapters Four and Six indicate, that in the process of rewriting the Bible, influences can be discerned from:

- Hellenism: characteristics of epic literature, such as foreshadowing and descriptions, also of historiography, and writing in the first person.
- biblical and extra- biblical sources: the suggestiveness of the unspoken word, *Song of Songs, Lamentations*, sapiential literature, and
- apology: at first glance it seems as if Abram’s reputation is whitewashed.
Furthermore, an insertion of independent forms takes place. The exegetical methods, which the author utilises often resemble the techniques used in aggadic midrash, such as:

- the use and the development of data from the Bible to further the aims of the author; Lot was with Abram and Sarai, and functioned as a prophet revealing the origin of the plagues,
- the name of Bethel (house of God) becomes very meaningful, for this is the place to which Abram returns after his Egyptian adventure,
- the double meaning of a biblical word: רַע (the link between רַע and רַע),
- dream motifs are used; both Abram and Horqonwash dream with the result that the narrative develops further (this can also be considered the "foreshadowing" of Hellenistic literature),
- the mentioning of the building of Hebron and Zoan --although this may be derived from Jubilees-- forms an attempt to fill in lacunae of time and place,
- at first glance it seems as if there is a tendency to emphasise the negative traits of the one, Pharaoh, and to render Abram's indecent behaviour more righteous, it was "inspired by the dream".

As I have written in 1.3.3. The Genre and Name of the Scroll: 23, these techniques do not render the narrative a midrash, for the author does not only explain the story and solve problems for the readers, but he also retells the narrative in his own attractive way. This retelling is very attractive, especially the deeper meaning of it. As soon as the strange "slips of the pen" are analysed, a totally new story develops. Then it becomes clear, why the author of the Genesis Apocryphon did not use the solution to the problem of Abram's journey to Egypt as Jubilees has it, for the purpose was completely different.
7.7. The Function of the Structure of the Narrative in 1QapGen

Similar to the *Genesis* version the *Apocryphon* has a concentric shape as can be seen in Chapter III. Yet, since the narrative is much longer in the *Genesis Apocryphon*, the concentric shape has also been very extended. This concentric shape functions as a means to hoodwink the audience, for it induced the reader to understand the narrative as the author presented it at first glance, namely from Abram’s point of view. Hence, the structure of the text was not helpful to find its deeper meaning, but it is to be added to the merit of the author that he was able to write a narrative with the same shape as the original, yet with a different content. In 3.7. **Analysis of the Narrative**, I have shown how the deeper meaning superseded the obvious.

7.8. The Theological Question of Abram’s Descent to Egypt

One of the events in the *Genesis* version, which have made people feel uneasy, is Abram’s act of leaving the Promised Land. Firstly, he is the first person who knows and acknowledges the Lord and consequently, he is considered the great example both in Judaism and Christianity. Secondly, he forgets God’s calling when he faces a famine. Such behaviour is not to be expected from him. Hence, solutions to this problem are sought in various ways.

The author of the *Genesis Apocryphon* seeks to grapple with the arrangement of the following words in *Genesis* 12: 10: לֵאמִּי נָּעַר אֲבָרָם יָשָׁב בְּהָיֶה לְאָבָּתוֹ. Gitay has shown that the order of the words לֵאמִּי נָּעַר אֲבָרָם יָשָׁב בְּהָיֶה לְאָבָּתוֹ alludes to the theological concern of Abram’s destination. God’s destination for Abram is Canaan, but Abram goes down to Egypt (1996: 213- 214). The arrangement of words alludes to the immorality of the episode in Egypt after Abram’s obedience to God’s calling to go to the Land, which God will show him. The author of the *Genesis Apocryphon* writes this narrative under the pseudonym Abram and consequently, represents
Abram's version of the story. Hence, he indicates that Abram cannot but leave the Promised Land, because there is a famine in all of the land. In order to survive Abram must leave Canaan. However, God is not involved in the decision-making process. In agreement with the Genesis version, Abram decides on his own account. The narrator tries to play down this fact by inserting a dream after Abram has entered Egypt, which suggests God's intervention, and his agreement with Abram's journey, for He gives Abram advice for his stay there.

However, my analysis in 3.7. tells another story: Abram has invented the dream and its interpretation in order to convince Sarai to pass him as her brother. Sarai's crying indicates that she understands that this means that he has repudiated her. In contrast to Abram's pesher, they live in quiet in Egypt for five years, which leads to Abram's plan to make his pesher come true. Then the unravelling of the plot takes place.

Hence, in the Genesis Apocryphon Abram's journey to Egypt is connected with the fact that God's promises did not materialise. He wanted to make a new beginning in Egypt, the land of abundance. Abram longed for security, which the nature of Canaan could not provide. In the process he forgot his calling.

In contrast, the author of the Book of Jubilees has rendered Abram a blameless man in whom there is no evil. The author of Jubilees exerts himself in using gematria to show God's engagement in Abram's life. Their relationship is growing from strength to strength. Abram's journey to Egypt is merely an incident on his walk with God. Abram is not in any way to blame when Pharaoh abducts Sarai, and God has a chance to react positively on Abram's request of seven years ago, never to forsake him.

In Antiquities Abram never intended to leave Canaan. The inducement to go to Egypt was the famine and he decided that it was a good opportunity to examine
the Egyptian religion and wisdom. However, his doctrine and learnedness proved to be superior to that of the Egyptians and instead of learning from them, he taught them arithmetic and astronomy, which they later passed on to the Greeks. Hence, his journey functioned as a means to find out that he was on the right track with his God. His return to Canaan is also written in such a way that it leaves no room for thinking that Abram would ever have wanted to stay in Egypt (Antiquities 1: viii: 3: 'Ως δ' εἰς τὴν Ζαυαναίαν ἀφικέτο).

Neither the solution by the author of the Book of Jubilees, nor the one in Antiquities was applicable to the situation, which the author of 1QapGen wanted to address. He did not need an example of righteousness or wisdom, but someone, who had to learn to grapple with the fact that he was called, or chosen for that matter. Hellenism had become a threat to Judaism in the days when the author of the Apocryphon lived, and he needed to write a narrative with which his Hellenistic, Jewish audience could identify. That is why he depicted Abram as a person, who forgets God’s calling, and goes to a fertile land, in which water was plenty and where it seemed that he would make a good living. The author alludes to the fact that in the process of forgetting his calling Abram becomes egoistic, and unjust towards his wife, whom he repudiates in a foreign country, subject to the lusts of the local population.

The message is that the abandonment of one’s calling makes people ruthless. Moreover, it is clear from the pericope that God will not allow his chosen people to leave Him. He will force them to return to Him and His ways.

7.9. The Genesis Apocryphon Today

A Genesis Apocryphon was the title of the first publication of the scroll by Avigad and Yadin (1956). This name is very appropriate, for the presentation of the archfather Abram is so different from the traditional presentation that this book
is not likely ever to attain a canonical status. The value of this pericope is its originality, and its presentation of a view on Abram, which was lost for many centuries. The *Genesis Apocryphon* deals with a phenomenon, which has been important throughout the existence of Judaism and religions related to it, i.e. the calling. The author wants to make clear that once God, the Ruler of the world, has called someone for a certain task, this person cannot evade Him. In the present era with its attraction of a Western life style and the abundance of violence against women, the narrative is still very modern and attractive, although it is inappropriate for liturgical use.
APPENDIX A

Recent information on the Dead Sea Scrolls can be obtained from:


APPENDIX B

Summary of Sternberg's "Literary Text, Literary Approach: Getting the Questions Straight", in his *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*.

Sternberg's approach is described in his book *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative* (1987). Therein he writes that knowledge of poetics is necessary when working with biblical texts. He describes poetics as "the systematic working or study of literature as such" (1987: 2).

A narrator has a relationship with his audience by means of the text. Hence, it is important to know the situation in life of the narrator and his audience (1987: 2). Other examples of important matters are: the purpose, which the author wants to accomplish (1987: 2), and a thorough knowledge of the language (grammar and semantics, 11), the operative codes of form and meaning (18), the circumstances in which the text came to existence (13), and the transmission of the text (13-14). Sternberg pleads for a source-oriented inquiry and a discourse-oriented analysis (14-15). This description shows that several disciplines may work on a specific text of the Bible, each focussing on their own specialisation, but taking into account results from other disciplines. Below, two of the examples he gives follow:

As reader, for example, the historian must take into account that every item of reality given in the text may have been stylized by conventions and for purposes alien to historical science. The linguist must reckon with the poetic manipulation of the rules of language, or else he will mistake the liberties taken by art for the encoded norms. (1987: 16)

This seems very difficult, if not impossible, but it is the only way to avoid a total misinterpretation. The readers must also realise that their reading of the text "is open to challenge or support from all others" (1987: 17).
Another important matter is how the Bible (source) is considered: as historiography or as fiction. In the case of fiction-writing there is a claim to freedom of invention, whereas in case of history-writing there is a claim to be a record of fact. The historian is committed to truth value. This, and not freedom of invention, is evident in the Bible. Sternberg supplies several examples of instances where the authors of the Bible use records in support of the historicity of the event:

Recall how often customs are elucidated, ancient names and current sayings traced back to their origins, monuments and fiats assigned a concrete reason as well as slot in history, persons and places and pedigrees specified beyond immediate needs, written records like the Book of Yashar or the royal annals explicitly invoked. (1987: 31)

Hence, the authors of the Bible meant to write the historical truth, with the result that their writings should be considered as such.

One of the reasons why the present-day readers experience problems accepting the Bible as a historiography is that its truth is given by divine inspiration. To the authors and their original audience this was a guarantee of the truthfulness. It was the only truth, and the authors were considered prophets transmitting it with authority. However, in modern times it has become important to be "objective" when writing a historical report and to have free access to information. Both seem to be lacking in biblical narrative, because of the appeal to divine inspiration (32-33). This is enhanced by the fact that biblical narrative and modern fiction are written in the third person. Hence, the privilege of omniscience is present in both. The difference is that the omniscience in the Bible is claimed to be the truth revealed by the God of History, with the result that it must be considered
historical. On the other hand, omniscience in modern fiction is the result of the claim to freedom of invention. Again, it is important to keep in mind the claim (historiography, fiction) by the authors and consider their work accordingly (34-35).

The function of the Bible is not only that it should be enjoyed for its beauty, or for the amusement it gives. Similar to other kinds of literature it serves other purposes, such as liturgical and ideological needs. The narrators give shape to a world-view (35-38). Many of the used techniques are not literary, but universal, because they are also used to give shape to non-literary stories. Sternberg supplies the following examples:

1. Temporal ordering, especially where the actual sequence diverges from the chronological.
2. Analogical design: parallelism, contrast, variation, recurrence, symmetry, chiasm.
3. Point of view, e.g., the teller's powers and manipulations, shifts in perspective from external to internal rendering or from narration to monologue and dialogue (often signalled by elements so minute as names and other referring terms).
5. Informational gapping, and ambiguity.
7. Modes of coherence, in units ranging from a verse to a book.
8. The interplay of verbal and compositional pattern. (1987: 39)
He considers it of utmost importance not to pass for literary devices phenomena such as chiasm and parallelism, which also occur in non-literary stories. Literariness is determined by "the dominance of the poetic function, the control it exerts over all the rest" (40). As examples, Sternberg compares an advertisement (non-literary) to a sonnet. In an advertisement:

the sound-pattern ultimately functions to increase the appeal (and sales) of the object announced, not, as in the sonnet, the perceptibility of the words.

(1987: 40)

The discourse of biblical narrative is regulated by ideology, historiography and aesthetics. Ideology establishes a world-view, historiography is occupied with the past only, and aesthetics is only artistic creativity. The three "enter into relations of tense complimentarity" (44). Historiography, being a description of theology in action, which co-determines the rules of a narrative, intermediates between ideology and aesthetics. Ideology and aesthetics destine the shape of the historiography (41-46).

According to the ideology, God's omniscience (and immortality) distinguish Him from humanity. That is why aesthetics is used to show that human knowledge falls short. Hence the gaps in the narrative and the withholding of information. Only by trying to understand the narrative the reader can attain "something of the vision that God has possessed all along" (47). The sustained effort to understand renders the reader a participant in a story, which explains who God is. Consequently, on the one hand, God is the norm and the source of knowledge, and on the other hand He is the object and the tester of knowledge (47-48).

It is impossible to make distinction between the above-mentioned principles. Since the whole "system operates by the processes of artistic communication" (48) it is important to find out which are those processes. That is where the poetics of
biblical narrative come in.

The above-mentioned might lead to the conclusion that reading the Bible is only possible to an elite. In the Bible itself is written in several instances that this is not the case (see e.g. Dt. 30: 11-14 and 31: 11-12). Everybody can understand the Bible on their own level. Counter-reading is not possible. Ignorance, wilfulness, preconception, and tendentiousness have led to some misunderstandings, but on the whole it can be said that the Bible is a "foolproof" book, because its story line, its world order and its value system are transparent (50). Most of the exegetes agree that: the narrators are reliable and tell the truth; they withhold information (hence, they do not tell the whole truth); and they use the free indirect style (51-52).

Stemberg suggests the following rules to become properly oriented in order to understand the Bible:

a) "The complexity of representation is inversely proportioned to that of evaluation: the more opaque" the plot, the more transparent the judgement (54).

b) Knowledge of biblical moral values help interpret. Interplay of norms between divergence and convergence occurs very often, but the narrative will always indicate what is right.

c) The "retrospective or last-minute clarification" elucidates who is right at the very end of the narrative, e.g. the narrative about the Binding of Isaac is followed by divine praise.

Stemberg concludes that "the safeguarding of the minimum truth" forms a characteristic of the composition of the Bible "and an index of its ideological basis" (56). He expresses the hope that more people will get involved in the use or the production of literary theory (57).
APPENDIX C.

The Genre of Column XIX: 14- 21.

1QapGen XIX: 14- 21 is a dream report. It is not simply a fable about trees, as Dehandschutter rightly remarks (1974: 52). Gnuse writes that:

Dream reports in the bible reflect how Israelites sought to portray their experience with the divine in one particular mode. (1996: 68)

Dream reports are in fact literary-theological forms, whose purpose it is:

to advance the plot by divine direction or prediction which informs the listeners or readers as to what will happen in the narrative. (1996: 68)

According to Gnuse:

There are two types of dream reports, one with a simple oral message (auditory message dream) and one wherein a scene appears before the dreamer (visual symbolic dream), often enigmatic in content and requiring interpretation. (1996: 70)


The characteristics of dreams are:

• dreams occur at night;
• auditory message reports deal with hearing and occasionally seeing;
• visual symbolic dreams involve only seeing;
Auditory message dreams are very different from the dream report, which we found in 1QapGen, especially since they involve a theophany in which God speaks to the dreamer. Visual symbolic dreams are more similar to the dream report in 1QapGen XIX: 14-21. However, they do not contain speech, whereas in 1QapGen XIX: 16 the date-palm shouts. What is shouted, however, is not a divine revelation as we see in the auditory message dreams, but it is merely functional in the continuation of the story. Since the context is one of seeing (יִשָּׂא and יִצַּו in XIX: 14, and יִשָּׂא in XIX: 16) one might as well state that Abram watches the palm-tree shouting, and that he is the one who gives words to (interprets) the shouting in his dream. Although 1QapGen dates back to a period later than the literature of the Hebrew Bible, 1QapGen XIX: 14-21 can at least be compared with the biblical genre of the visual symbolic dream. Gnuse writes, that 1QapGen dates back to a period later than 250 B.C.E., when the Jews, after a period during which an increasingly negative view of dreams developed, showed a new interest in dream reports as a format to describe a revelatory experience. 121

121 In her description of Abram's dream in 1QapGen Luijken Gevitz uses Oppenheim's two main types of dreams in ancient Near Eastern Literature, i.e. "revelation" dreams and "symbolic" dreams, which Gnuse has reworked to the system which I use in this thesis. (Oppenheim 1956: 186-217; Gnuse 1996: 45). Similar to Gnuse's "visual symbolic dreams", Oppenheim's "symbolic" dreams tend to be more obscure than "revelation" dreams (Gnuse: "auditory message dreams"), and they require interpretation. Symbolic "dreams frequently involve common objects and daily-life situations which have a deeper symbolic meaning for the dreamer" (Luijken Gevitz 1992: 231). In Oppenheim's description of symbolic dreams there is no emphasis on visuality, which renders Luijken Gevitz's conclusion comprehensible that "Abram's dream in the Genesis Apocryphon is an example of a symbolic dream about two trees...involved in a common, real-life situation" (Luijken Gevitz 1992: 231). However, the reader must realise that the report of Abram's dream in the Genesis Apocryphon does not date back to the period
In apocalyptic and other pseudepigraphal works of the time dream reports were often "inserted into accounts of biblical characters, when no such report was in the original biblical narrative" (Gnuse 1996: 96-98). One of the examples where this happens is 1QapGen XIX: 14-21. Here the visual symbolic dream is inserted into the text with the result that Abram and Sarai are not to blame for the lie they tell Pharaoh. On the other hand, God is never mentioned as the One who revealed to Abram that he should tell this lie. Consequently, He is not to blame either. Furthermore, Abram's ability to interpret the dream:

added to his portrayal as a wise man and would fit well with the picture of Abram which had begun to develop elsewhere in extra-biblical exegetical literature, namely as the prototype of wisdom and knowledge. (Luijken Gevirtz 1992: 241)

An analysis of the visual symbolic dream leads to the following pattern:

1. announcement of the dream,
2. introductory dream formula,
3. dream corpus with description of the image and the result of the image's activity,
4. interpretation of the dream (formula of interpretation, identification of the symbols, and meaning of the symbols),
5. dream fulfilment (Gnuse 1996: 75).

All these patterns are discernible in 1QapGen XIX: 14-21.

1) In XIX: 14, the announcement: "And I, Abram, dreamt a dream."
2) In XIX: 14, the introductory dream formula: פְּנֵי, "[and loo]k", which is, I admit, a restoration. However, this restoration can be found in the work of

Oppenheim writes about.
several scholars, such as: AY; Fitzmyer; JL VdW; and Beyer.

3) In XIX: 14-17, the dream corpus with description of the image and the result of the image's activity: "and [it was] not [cut down]."

4) In line 19ff, the interpretation of the dream, introduced by a formula of interpretation: "[and I told] h[er the interpretation of this] dream, [and] s[aid]"... This is also a restored reading, found in Fitzmyer, and JL VdW. Beyer also has a formula of interpretation, which is somewhat different (1984: 172-3). In the remainder of the text there is a lacuna at the place where the symbols were to be identified. The meaning of the symbols is also missing, and the dream, which Abram relates to the reader/listener in XIX: 14-17 is not repeated in the text when he tells his dream to Sarai (see XIX: 18). In the present text the compelling passage "who will seek to kill me and leave you (alone)" occurs immediately after the above-mentioned lacuna, which does not supply enough space in order to both identify the symbols and tell which symbol stands for what.

There might, however, be a good reason to break with the normal pattern in this situation. It might suggest the seriousness of the dream and the shock it caused. Abram went to Egypt to flee the famine (XIX: 10-11), but now his life (continued existence) was threatened not by hunger, but by covetous eyes! The author does not allow himself to take the time to explain it to the reader/listener symbol by symbol: this is a matter of life and death! Hence, the author indicates the fear, which Abram admits to have in XIX: 18, and the importance of solving the problem. This way of writing also adds to the liveliness of the story.
APPENDIX D.

Midrash.

The study of 1QapGen and the *Book of Jubilees* has brought to light that the two rewritten Bible books make extensive use of devices known from aggadic midrashim with the aim to understand events, which occurred during their own time. Hananel Mack has written about devices in aggadic midrashim in his *The Aggadic Midrash Literature* (1989). The following examples are derived from his book. The numbers refer to the pages where they can be found.

Examples:

- The aggadah attempts to utilise methods found in the Bible and to develop them further (199):
  - the metaphor (199),
  - data from the Bible are used and developed to further its own aims (199),
  - the stress on certain letters and details (transition from plural to singular), and on words or language (121-122).
  - a general impression of the situation underlies the words of the aggadah (122).
  - names are interpreted (122).
  - interpretation of biblical words (double meaning, 123).
- Infrequently appearing verb roots are connected (explanation of one text by means of the other, 124).
- Derashot of "al tikra" (125).
- Anthropomorphism or personification (126).
- The aggadah uses dream motifs to translate symbols into the language of action (126).
- Attempt to fill in lacunae of time and place (127).
- Attempt to link together people and objects (127).
- The transference of the reality of the Sages to that of the Bible. In order to create a sense of continuity they inserted passages in the story, which reflect customs of their own time (129).
- The tendency a) to stress the negative traits of some, and b) to absolve others of any defects, and c) to render just less just, and unjust more righteous (129).
- The reconciliation of contradictions (130).
- An action forced on someone becomes a positive action in its own right (131).
- A chance encounter is transformed into a deliberate act and even a prayer (132).
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