

Prof. Dr. Devorah Dimant and Prof. Dr. Reinhard G. Kratz

The Interpretation of the Book of Genesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls: A German-Israeli Research Cooperation (2007 – 2011)

The report will offer a retrospective presentation of a German-Israeli research cooperation. The project was funded during the years 2007–2011 by the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* (DFG) and was housed under the auspices of the *Centrum Orbis Orientalis et Occidentalis* (Centre for Ancient and Oriental Studies of the University of Göttingen and the Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Göttingen). The project was initiated and directed by R.G. Kratz of the University of Göttingen, Germany, and D. Dimant of the University of Haifa, Israel. Two teams were established in the respective universities, each consisting of one post-doctoral researcher (Dr. R. Vielhauer in Göttingen and Dr. L. Goldman in Haifa), one doctoral student (H. Samuel in Göttingen and A. Livneh in Haifa), and one M.A. research assistant. The post-doctoral researchers undertook the writing of monographs of particular subjects, while the Ph.D. students were engaged in writing their dissertations under the supervision of the two principal investigators. For communication and the continuous exchange of relevant data (concordance of relevant texts, bibliography), a joint internet platform was established. Furthermore, joint workshops in Haifa (2008) and in Göttingen (2009) were organized to discuss the results and to outline further perspectives. In 2007 and 2011, two international conferences were launched around the themes relevant to the project, the proceedings of which were subsequently published. Both meetings took place in Göttingen; the second was funded by the Lichtenberg-Kolleg, Göttingen. Both directors were fortunate to be elected fellows of the Lichtenberg-Kolleg during the academic year 2010–2011 and they would like to thank its former director, Professor D. Coester-Waltjen, for her generous and unflinching support.

1. The Research Topic

The project was devoted to a topic that requires investigation of biblical exegesis in close association with Qumran research. The Qumran manuscripts, or in their more popular designation, the Dead Sea Scrolls, are perhaps among the most famous ancient documents to be unearthed in the twentieth century. Discovered more than sixty years ago in eleven caves near the site of Qumran, on the western shore of the Dead Sea, the news of their finding and the initial information that came to light both

about the documents themselves and their mysterious owners kindled the imagination of the public and remained engraved in the memory of many. Yet the nature of the documents, along with their protracted publication, shaped Qumran research in a specific way. The fact that the relatively well-preserved Scrolls from cave 1 were mostly sectarian (the *Rule of the Community*, the *War Scroll*, *Hodayot*, and the *Pesher of Habakkuk*), relating to the peculiar ascetic, probably Essene, community, had a decisive influence on the overall development of Qumran research. Since not much beyond these Scrolls was published in the first decades following the discovery, the impression was created that the entire library was sectarian, and that to a large extent everything that was significant had already been published.

Most scholars were unaware of the fact that the lion's share of the findings from the richest Qumran cave, known as cave 4, remained unpublished. In fact, no clear picture was available of what precisely was included in the Qumran collection. It was not known that the library also contained a large corpus of parabiblical texts that rework the Hebrew Bible. This situation has been remedied in the last two decades, with the completion of the publication of all the texts unearthed during the initial discovery. It is now known that some 200 manuscripts of the one thousand mostly fragmentary manuscripts discovered at Qumran are copies of biblical books, a quarter are texts related to the Qumran community, while another third consists of texts reworking the Hebrew Bible in various ways but not containing the terminology and distinctive literary style produced by this community.¹ Most of this final category comes from works previously unknown.

In its entirety, the Qumran library opens up a variety of new perspectives on a host of aspects of the literary activity that took place in Judea in the last centuries before the common era. The diverse sectarian texts introduce new genres, styles and themes that were previously unknown. The plethora of readings and textual types presented by the biblical manuscripts illuminate the stages in the process by which the final text of the Hebrew Bible was established. The number and diversity of texts that adapt materials from the Hebrew Bible, written in both Hebrew and Aramaic, throw fresh light on the multifaceted and elaborate methods developed during this period to interpret biblical texts. The process of interpretation started already within the biblical corpus itself, a fact known from the literary history of the biblical books, and evidenced in late biblical

¹ Cf. D. Dimant, "The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance," in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness* (ed. D. Dimant and L. Schiffman; STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 23–58.

books such as Chronicles and Daniel. The Qumran texts, reworking biblical sources during the final centuries of the Second Temple period, constitute a link between the biblical tradition, various apocryphal writings, the New Testament and subsequent rabbinic exegetical compilations. They thus illuminate decisive stages in the shaping of ancient Judaism and nascent Christianity in a special way.

A major task of Qumran research in the last decades has involved tracing in the Qumran texts the contours of biblical interpretation forged in these centuries. However, the fact that Qumran biblical interpretation has antecedents in the Hebrew Bible itself has been neglected until now. Given this evidence, the Scrolls assist in uncovering the literary and interpretative stages by which the final shaping and stabilization of the biblical text took place. In this respect, the Qumranic parabiblical texts, which rework the Hebrew Bible, are of major importance since they share literary and exegetical methods and traditions with many non-Qumranic compositions as well as with the biblical text itself. Consequently, they shed significant light on the way the biblical texts were formed and interpreted in the process of their textual growth and transmission. Two lines of investigation should, therefore, be followed when studying the pertinent texts from Qumran: the reception and use in the Qumran Scrolls of the biblical textual *Vorlage*; and the literary history of the biblical *Vorlage* itself in relation to its appropriation by the writers of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

The interpretation and reworking of the book of Genesis in the Qumran texts suggested itself as an appropriate textual basis for such an enterprise, due to the fact that Genesis features prominently among the Qumran Hebrew and Aramaic rewritten Bible texts. The biblical patriarchs have a significant role within this corpus and therefore appeared to be a suitable theme on which to focus during this project. Various Hebrew and Aramaic texts were selected around this topic. They were examined to see how the patriarchs are presented in them, how these presentations are linked to their biblical antecedents, and how the biblical literary origins affected subsequent interpretation within the Hebrew Bible and later literature alike.

2. Abraham in the Hebrew Bible and at Qumran

The teams in Haifa and Göttingen coordinated closely during their work and contributed to each other's efforts. The Abraham tradition provided

the initial focal point. Apart from a few notable exceptions,² Qumran scholarship and biblical studies tend to treat Abraham with no reference to one another. In order to remedy this situation, Vielhauer combines both areas of research in his *Habilitationschrift* and compares biblical and Qumran materials in relation to their inclusion/integration of the Abraham tradition.

In the biblical tradition,³ and in addition to the priestly texts, Vielhauer detected a pre-priestly narrative thread (Genesis 12*; 13*; 18–19*; 21*) that represents the oldest tradition regarding Abraham, pointing already to themes beyond Abraham and connecting this patriarch's story to other Genesis traditions (the "Yahwist" in the classic terminology). Vielhauer proposes a supplementary hypothesis for all other texts relating to Abraham. He distinguishes between pre-priestly and post-priestly narratives. As far as the integration of Abraham at Qumran is concerned, he found that in particular the post-priestly additions in Gen 14:18–20; 15; 18:13–33; 19:29; 20; 22 were used in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Within Qumran documents, a number of specific Qumran texts in addition to sporadic individual references are particularly relevant for developing traditions regarding Abraham: *Jubilees*, *Genesis Apocryphon* (1Q20), *Reworked Pentateuch A* (4Q158), *Ages of Creation or Peshar on the Periods* (4Q180), *Pseudo-Jubilees* (4Q225–4Q226), *Commentary on Genesis A* (4Q252), *Exposition on the Patriarchs* (4Q464). For the study of the *Genesis Apocryphon* (1Q20), one can now use the new edition of the text prepared by D. Machiela.⁴ Vielhauer successfully reconstructed the scroll of *Reworked Pentateuch A* (4Q158), allowing him now to classify and position

2 M. Köckert, 'Ahnvater, Fremdling, Weiser. Lesarten der Bibel in Gen 12, Gen 20 und Qumran,' in *Das Buch der Bücher – gelesen. Lesarten der Bibel in den Wissenschaften und Künsten* (ed. S. Martus and A. Polaschegg; Publikationen zur Zeitschrift für Germanistik NF 13; Bern: Peter Lang, 2006), 139–169; R.G. Kratz, "Abraham, mein Freund'. Das Verhältnis von inner- und außerbiblischer Schriftauslegung," in *Die Erzväter in der biblischen Tradition* (ed. A.C. Hagedorn and H. Pfeiffer; BZAW 400; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 115–136; R.G. Kratz, "Friend of God, Brother of Sarah, and Father of Isaac. Abraham in the Hebrew Bible and in Qumran," in *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran* (ed. D. Dimant and R.G. Kratz; FAT II/35; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 79–105; G. Granerod, *Abraham and Melchizedek. Scribal Activity of Second Temple Times in Genesis 14 and Psalm 110* (BZAW 406; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010); A. Mühling, *Blickt auf Abraham, euren Vater. Abraham als Identifikationsfigur des Judentums in der Zeit des Exils und des Zweiten Tempels* (FRLANT 236; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011).

3 See R.G. Kratz, *Die Komposition der erzählenden Überlieferung des Alten Testaments* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 239–247 and 263–280 (Eng. *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament* [London: T. & T. Clark, 2005], 238–244 and 260–274).

4 D.A. Machiela, *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon: A New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13–17* (STDJ 79; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

fragment 4, which is of crucial importance for an understanding of the references to Abraham. Additionally, Vielhauer checked in detail the DJD edition against the original manuscripts and proposed several improvements on readings provided in DJD. His results are similar to those arrived at by M. Zahn in her recent study.⁵ For the texts *Ages of Creation* or *Pesher of the Periods* (4Q180) and *Pseudo-Jubilees* (4Q225–4Q226), Vielhauer was able to utilize the detailed preliminary work done on the textual data by the Israeli partners; the cooperation between the two teams was especially close in this area.⁶

Vielhauer uses four examples in order to investigate the topic. In each case it could be shown that the adoption and interpretation of the tradition at Qumran connects almost directly with the inner-biblical interpretation within the composition of the book of Genesis. The four cases investigated are:

- a. The promises to the patriarchs and their endangerment (Gen 12:1–4; Genesis 15; 17; 22; as well as *Jubilees*, *Pseudo-Jubilees* [4Q225]; *Commentary on Genesis A* [4Q252]);
- b. The endangerment of the ancestors (Genesis 12; 20; 26; and *Genesis Apocryphon* [1Q20 XIX, 10–XX, 32]; *Jub.* 13:11–16);
- c. Abraham and Sodom and Gomorrah (Genesis 18–19 as well as *Ages of Creation* [4Q180]; *Commentary on Genesis A* [4Q252]; *Midrash on Eschatology* [4Q177 l]; *Jub.* 16:1–9);
- d. Abraham at war (Genesis 14; *Jub.* 13:22–29; 11QMelchizedek [11Q13]).

Another important text for the reception and interpretation of the Abraham tradition at Qumran was studied in detail by Livneh in her doctoral dissertation: *Pseudo-Jubilees from Qumran (4Q225 – 4Q226 – 4Q227): A New Edition, Introduction, and Commentary*. The dissertation was approved and accepted in 2011 by the University of Haifa. The three manuscripts 4Q225, 4Q226, and 4Q227—dated on paleographic grounds to between ca. 50 BCE and 20 CE—contain a number of reworked biblical pericopes, such as the Covenant between the Pieces (4Q225 2 i 3–8; Gen 15:2–6), Isaac’s sacrifice (4Q225 2 i 9–ii 10; 4Q226 7 1–2; Genesis 22), a

5 M.M. Zahn, *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture. Composition and Exegesis in the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts* (STDJ 95; Leiden: Brill, 2011).

6 D. Dimant, “The ‘Pesher on the Periods’ (4Q180) and 4Q181,” *Israel Oriental Society* 9 (1979): 77–102; and more recently, idem, “On Righteous and Sinners: 4Q181 Reconsidered,” in *Manières de penser dans l’Antiquité méditerranéenne et orientale* (ed. C. Batsch and M. Värtejanu-Joubert; JSJS 134; Boston: Brill, 2009), 61–85.

genealogical list from Abraham to Levi (4Q225 2 ii 10–12 = 4Q226 7 2–5), the Exodus (4Q225 1; 2 ii 13–14; 4Q226 1; 2?), the wandering in the desert (4Q226 3; 4; Deut 31:2–3), and the entry into Canaan (4Q226 6; Joshua 1–5), as well as a possible reference to the judges (4Q226 5 1). 4Q227 also contains a biography of Enoch (4Q227 2; cf. Gen 5:21–24). The reworked pericopes differ from their biblical source; the abbreviations, paraphrases, and legendary additions that they incorporate classify them as exegetical compositions belonging to the category of “rewritten Bible.”

On the basis of the resemblances between the three scrolls, their first editor, J. Milik, considered them to be copies of the same composition. This conclusion rests on two sets of data: a) the evident parallelism between 4Q225 2 ii 8–14 and 4Q226 7; b) the fact that all three texts employ terms and/or motifs familiar from *Jubilees*. These similarities led Milik to label 4Q225–4Q226–4Q227 as “Pseudo-Jubilees.” J. VanderKam, who completed Milik’s work, retained Milik’s title in the first publication of these manuscripts in DJD XIII. With respect to 4Q225–4Q226, Livneh agrees: a close similarity in sequence and language between 4Q225 2 ii 8–12 and 4Q226 7 1–5 permits the acceptance of Milik’s conclusion that they are possibly variant textual traditions of the same work. 4Q227, however, exhibits no such parallels to either 4Q225 or 4Q226, and also differs from 4Q225–4Q226 in terms of content. Therefore, Livneh suggests that 4Q227 most probably does not belong to 4Q225–4Q226.

The fragments constituting 4Q225–4Q226 include a concise retelling of selected pericopes from the history of the people of Israel, according to the chronological order in which they appear in the biblical texts (cf. 4Q225 2 i–ii). This historical résumé, however, juxtaposes biblical sections that were originally separate, with the reconstituted units forming an associative chain. Atar Livneh proposes the explanation that the composition depicts the history of the people of Israel by way of the history of the covenant, its foundation and fulfilment throughout history. In comparison with the concise style evidenced in the remainder of the composition, the reworked *aqedah* and Exodus pericopes (4Q225 2 i 9–ii 10; cf. 4Q226 7 1–2 and 4Q225 1; 2 ii 13–14; 4Q226 1; 2? respectively) are striking in length. They are full of additional legendary material (cf. 4Q225 1 3; 2 i 9–10; 2 i 14–ii 1; 2 ii 4, 5–7, 13–14). Several affinities also link the two themes. Both serve as examples of the way in which the forces of evil plot to destroy the covenant; they occur in virtually the same sequence.

Concerning the method of interpretation, it is noteworthy that 4Q225–4Q226 also incorporate chronological additions within various pericopes (cf. 4Q225 2 i 2; 2 ii 10–12 [= 4Q226 7 2–5]; 4Q226 1 4–5; 2 3?; 3 2). With both these and the legendary additions being highly condensed and fre-

quently implicit (cf. 4Q225 2 i 2, 9–10; 2 i 14–ii 1), one may conclude that the author assumed specific knowledge on the part of his audience with respect to certain exegetical problems and/or traditions. The extra-biblical additions also shed light on the author's worldview. History is presented as a predetermined and set interval of time that is divided into periods (4Q225 1 7; 4Q226 1 4–7; 2 3). The world of celestial beings is divided dualistically into “good” and “bad” figures (cf. most prominently 4Q225 2 ii 5–7), with the angels, including “Prince Mastema,” the “angels of *Mastemot*,” the “angels of holiness,” and “Belial,” intervening in human events (4Q225 1 7; 2 i 9–10; ii 5–7, 13–14). While this perspective closely corresponds to the tenets of the Qumran community, the absence of terminology specific to the latter suggests that 4Q225–4Q226 did not originate with the Qumran sect itself but derived from circles close to it.

As already noted at the beginning of the research on these manuscripts, several significant affinities exist between 4Q225–4Q226 and the book of *Jubilees*. These include traditions concerning Mastema's involvement in the *aqedah* and (probably) the Exodus (4Q225 2 i 9–10; ii 13–14; *Jub.* 17:16, 48:15, 18); the sentence: “And you, Moses, when I speak with [you] the creation until the day of the creation” (4Q225 1 6–7), which resembles *Jub.* 1:26–29; and the special status held by Levi and the priestly dynasty (4Q225 2 ii 10–12 = 4Q226 7 3–5; cf. *Jub.* 30:18–19, 31:4–17, 32:1–9). An analysis of these affinities, however, demonstrates that 4Q225–4Q226 differ from *Jubilees*. Both share traditions apparently known to wider circles. The title *Pseudo-Jubilees* should, therefore, be discarded.

3. Amram and Levi in the Hebrew Bible and at Qumran

The priestly patriarchs Amram and Levi provided a second focus of study in this project. Goldman is currently preparing a monograph studying the Aramaic work entitled *Visions of Amram*. This work has been preserved in five or seven copies (4Q543–4Q547, 4Q548 [?], 4Q549 [?]). É. Puech, responsible for the *editio princeps*, considers all seven manuscripts to be copies of the *Visions of Amram*.⁷ Previous studies of this work have focused on three topics: a) the beginning of the text, which can be reconstructed from the overlapping of the five copies; b) its genre as a testament and its link to the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and similar Aramaic works from Qumran, such as the *Aramaic Levi Document* and the *Testa-*

7 É. Puech, *Qumran Grotte 4.XXII: Textes araméens, première partie: 4Q529–549* (DJD XXXI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001), 283–405.

ment of *Qohat*; c) its dualistic nature, adduced from an analysis of the description of Amram's encounter with the Angels of Light and Darkness, and its terminology. Two new studies of this extremely fragmentary composition have recently been undertaken. The first is a second edition of the text with an English translation and partial reconstruction of the order and textual sequence. The second is a socio-historical examination of the circles in which the composition was written, based on an investigation of its concepts and terminology.⁸

However, to date, no efforts have been made to reconstruct the structure and content of the work as a whole. Goldman's monograph aims at filling this gap. This monograph on the composition of the *Visions of Amram* will present the various literary pericopae of this work and engage in a linguistic, literary, and exegetical analysis of each unit, with the aim of elucidating its biblical background and identifying the new ideas it contains, as well as addressing the issues of how many copies of the work exist, its dualistic thought, and its generic classification as a testament in view of the book's overall perspective.

Goldman recognizes six distinct units within the entire composition: a narrative introductory framework describing Amram's delivery of his testament to his sons; a narrative depicting Amram's journey to Canaan to bury his ancestors; Amram's first dream-vision in Canaan, in which he sees two angels, one good, one evil; the dream-visions revealed to Amram dealing with Moses' name and his future role in the Exodus; dream-visions relating to Aaron, his eternal priesthood, and the priestly ordinances; and a scene concluding the testament. As far as the manuscript 4Q548 is concerned, which shows no textual overlapping with the other manuscripts, Goldman explores the possibility that it does not belong to the *Visions of Amram* but derives from a different composition or was added subsequently. One of the major differences is the dualistic concept.⁹ Moreover, 4Q549 displays no overlap with the other manuscripts attributed to this composition and appears to have been added at a later stage in order to close the document with a genealogical list of Amram's descendants. Although extremely fragmentary in their extant form, the visions concerning Moses' and Aaron's future destiny, based on the biblical narrative of the Exodus, apparently formed the central part of the text. The exegesis is

8 K. Trehuedic, "Les visions du testament d'Amram A-E;F(?);G(?)," in *Torah: Exode - Lévitique - Nombres*, Vol. 2 of *La Bibliothèque de Qumrân* (ed. K. Berthelot and T. Legrand; Paris: Cerf, 2010), 207-231; R.R. Duke, *The Social Location of the Visions of Amram (4Q543 - 547)* (Studies in Biblical Literature 135; New York: Peter Lang, 2010).

9 See L. Goldman, "Dualism in the Visions of Amram," *RevQ* 24 (2010): 421-432. Here Goldman compares the different dualistic concepts.

commensurate with the composition's testamentary genre and with the evidence that it forms part of the testamentary literary output belonging to the Qumran priestly line.

The figure of Levi, son of Jacob, and his integration into Qumran literature from the Hebrew Bible is investigated by Samuel in his Göttingen doctoral dissertation. The starting point for the work is the *Aramaic Testament of Levi*, also known as *Aramaic Levi Document*, which has been preserved in several copies/versions from Qumran, the Cairo Geniza, as part of an interpolation in a Greek manuscript of *T. 12 Patr.* as well as in a Syriac excerpt. Here, Samuel could use two recent editions.¹⁰ A recently discovered fragment from the Genizah supplements the textual data but does not yield any new insights.¹¹ Both of the new editions of the material concentrate on a comparison with contemporary literature from the Second Temple period and neglect the obvious connections to the biblical material and the inner-biblical development of the figure of Levi. The question remains as to why Levi, who plays quite an insignificant role in the narrative passages of the Hebrew Bible, becomes such a prominent figure during the intertestamental period (*Jos. Asen.*; *T. 12 Patr.*; *T. Mos.*). At the same time, the question of Levi as a literary figure and its connection to the development of the Levites in the Second Temple period has largely been neglected in biblical scholarship. Most of the studies addressing these issues are based on historical and literary models that are in dire need of revision; this need can be seen in the fact that the focus is still on the pre-exilic period or even on the period before the emergence of Israel and Judah.

In light of the current state of research, Samuel concentrates his study on the biblical material. He concludes that there are only a few pre-exilic passages in the Hebrew Bible that mention the Levites. Additionally, these passages were frequently reworked, rendering it almost impossible to glean historical information from these texts about the Levites during the pre-exilic period. The main focus of Samuel's study is the book of Deuteronomy, as this biblical text offers the most extensive literary history of the term "Levite." The earliest statements regarding Levites (Deut 12:18; 14:27; 17:9; 18:1*, 6–8; 26:11) mention them either as part of the extended family (*erweiterte Festfamilie*) or as potential priests. The latter is the rule in the deuteronomic *Fortschreibung* of Deuteronomy and also occurs in the

10 J.C. Greenfield, M. E. Stone, and E. Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document. Edition, Translation, Commentary* (SVTP 19; Boston: Brill, 2004); H. Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text from Qumran. A New Interpretation of the Levi Document* (JSJS 86; Boston: Brill, 2004).

11 G. Bohak, "קטע גניזה חדש של חיבור לוי הארמי," *Tarbiz* 79 (5771): 373–383.

non-priestly strata of the book of Exodus. The distinction between priests and Levites (i. e. Levites as *clerus minor* or *personae miserae*) is a late development within the literary history of Deuteronomy and a similar development can be traced in the later priestly traditions in Numbers and Chronicles. According to Samuel, the significance of the book of Ezekiel in regard to the Levites is rather marginal. As far as the figure of Levi is concerned, who features as a son of Jacob in Genesis, and elsewhere as the ancestor of the priests, Samuel identifies the Levitical origin of Moses in Exodus 2 as the grain and source of its further development in Genesis 34, Exodus 6, and Malachi.

In the course of his study, Samuel has been able to show that the texts from Qumran continue these literary developments, probably stemming from the latest stages of the Hebrew Bible. At the same time, the Qumran texts seem to reflect the final phase of the development of these traditions. On the one hand, the classic tripartite division into priests, Levites and "Israel" that is known to us from the New Testament, rabbinic Judaism and still valid today, was already applicable and undisputed in the literature from Qumran. The Qumran texts that draw passages from the Hebrew Bible concerning the Levites seem to consolidate the distinction between priests and Levites, the priests always appearing first. Simultaneously, Levi, as the ancestor of the cultic personnel, acquires his own literary life through compositions that focus on his priestly functions. In the Hebrew Bible, Levi serves as a bridge between the patriarchs and the Exodus but in the post-biblical literature he is presented as guaranteeing the maintenance of a priestly line already in the generations preceding Sinai.

4. International Cooperation

Both foci of the research cooperation as well as additional issues regarding method and various aspects of the topic (including the other patriarchs and their descendants) were addressed during two workshops held in Göttingen and Haifa. The first of two international conferences was devoted to the phenomenon of exegesis at Qumran and its biblical and extra-biblical pre-history.¹² The second one, which also marked the closure of the project, was devoted to the patriarchal traditions, and the relation they

12 D. Dimant and R.G. Kratz, ed., *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran* (FAT 35; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009) contains contributions by M. Bar Asher, G. Brooke, D. Dimant, A. Felman, L. Goldman, J. Joosten, A. Klein, I. Kottsieper, R.G. Kratz; P. Porzig, A. Steudel, and E. Tov.

display between narrative and law.¹³ Additionally, the project served as a platform for further research and attracted several academic visitors from Germany and abroad. F. Ede, a doctoral student at Göttingen is working on the Joseph narrative and its acceptance at Qumran. Dr. D. Machiela (Hamilton, ON, Canada) was awarded a research grant from the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation and a Ph.D. student from Princeton will come to Göttingen on a Fulbright grant. Both plan to work on the Aramaic texts from Qumran focusing on the book of Genesis. Dr. J. Ben-Dov (Haifa) will be joining us in Göttingen to work on the Aramaic texts of *1 Enoch*; his stay will also mark the continuation of the cooperation between the Qumran institutes of Haifa and Göttingen.

Prof. Dr. Reinhard G. Kratz
Georg August Universität Göttingen
Theologische Fakultät
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 2
D-37073 Göttingen
Tel: +49 – 551 – 39 – 7129/7130
Fax: +49 – 551 – 39 – 22228
rkratz@gwdg.de

Prof. Dr. Devorah Dimant
University of Haifa
Department of Biblical Studies
Mount Carmel
Haifa 31905
Tel: +972 04 – 8249044
Fax: +972 04 – 8240701
ddim@research.haifa.ac.il

¹³ Currently in preparation, *Narrative and Law in the Patriarchal Traditions: Hebrew Bible and Dead Sea Scrolls* (BZAW; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012 [forthcoming]) will contain contributions by M. Bar-Asher, M. Bernstein, G. Brooke, D. Dimant, R.G. Kratz, A. Livneh, L. Goldman, H. Samuel, L. Schiffman, M. Segal, A. Shemesh, and E. Tov.