

## CRITICAL NOTES

### INCOMPLETE CIRCUMCISION IN EGYPT AND EDM: JEREMIAH (9:24–25) IN THE LIGHT OF JOSEPHUS AND JONCKHEERE

הָנָה יָמִים בָּאִים נֹאסְדָּהּ וּפְקֻדָּתִי עַל־כָּל־מוֹל בְּעֶרְלָהּ: עַל־מִצְרַיִם וְעַל־יְהוּדָה וְעַל־אֲדוֹם וְעַל־בְּנֵי עַמּוֹן  
וְעַל־מוֹאָב וְעַל כָּל־קְצוּצֵי פֶאֶה הַיֹּשְׁבִים בְּמִדְבָּר כִּי כָל־הַגּוֹיִם עֶרְלִים וְכָל־בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל עֶרְלִילִב:

The passage in Jeremiah dealing with circumcision (9:24–25) has puzzled students of the book for a long time. Nearly three centuries ago, J. H. Michaelis called it “*difficillimus*”; two decades ago, A. W. Blackwood, Jr., labeled it “bewildering.” More recently, W. L. Holladay has written:

As to the meaning of the passage, one hardly knows whether it is badly framed and/or badly preserved, or whether it is making a subtle and ironic point, or both. Certainly what has been transmitted is far from easy to follow.<sup>1</sup>

The problem is obvious from one glance at the new Jewish Publication Society translation:

Lo, days are coming—declares the Lord—when I will take note of everyone circumcised in the foreskin: of Egypt, Judah, Edom, the Ammonites, Moab, and all the desert dwellers who have the hair of their temples clipped. For all these nations are uncircumcised, but all the House of Israel are uncircumcised of heart.

As noted by the translators in a footnote, the main uncertainty in this translation is the rendering of the Hebrew phrase מֹל בְּעֶרְלָהּ as “circumcised in the foreskin.”<sup>2</sup> This is only one of a number of interpretations that have been proposed. But even if we accept

I am greatly indebted to David Berger, Louis H. Feldman, S. Z. Leiman, Edward Reichman, Robert K. Ritner, and Jack Sasson for their invaluable guidance and stimulating comments. I am similarly grateful to the staffs of the Gottesman Library, the Pollack Library, the Wilbour Library, and the Institute for Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts for their very gracious assistance. I would also like to thank Dov Siegman, who served as my research assistant during the writing of this article.

<sup>1</sup> J. H. Michaelis, *Biblia Hebraica* (Halaë Magdeburgicae: Tipis & sumtibus Orphanotrophei, 1720) 413; A. W. Blackwood, Jr., *Commentary on Jeremiah* (Waco: Word Books, 1977) 109; W. L. Holladay, *Jeremiah 1* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986) 319.

<sup>2</sup> Virtually all commentators view מֹל בְּעֶרְלָהּ as a syntactic unit. It is true that, in Jer 27:8 and 44:13, Y-ב X על פ-קִד means “visit (punish) X with Y,” but it hardly makes sense to take עֶרְלָהּ as a punishment in this context.

the translation as accurate, we still cannot give an answer to the most elementary question: Does the passage say that the Egyptians, the Edomites, the Ammonites, the Moabites, and the Arabs were circumcised or uncircumcised? The first sentence of the translation gives one answer, while the second gives another.

Our passage has often been compared with Ezek 32:29, 32, but those verses are equally unclear. They tell us that Edom and Egypt are lying with the uncircumcised in the Pit, but why? Is it because they themselves are *not* circumcised or despite the fact that they *are*? The assumption of modern scholars that they were circumcised is—or, at least, *should be*—based primarily on extrabiblical sources.<sup>3</sup> The passages in Jeremiah and Ezekiel are customarily interpreted in the light of that evidence today, but taken by themselves they are ambiguous.<sup>4</sup>

And what of the extrabiblical evidence? Early modern scholars compared our passage with classical and patristic sources dealing with circumcision, but those sources too left many questions unanswered. Although Herodotus (2.36, 37, 104) states that the Egyptians practiced circumcision, other sources imply that the practice was not universal. And although Jerome asserts that all of the peoples listed in Jer 9:25 were circumcised in his day, Josephus (*Ant.* 13.9.1 §§257–58) seems to imply that the Idumeans (= Edomites) were uncircumcised before being converted to Judaism by John Hyrcanus.<sup>5</sup>

Recent studies of ancient circumcision and the Josephan passage have made it possible to resolve all of these ambiguities and contradictions. In this note, I shall argue that those studies corroborate Rashi's interpretation, as modified by A. B. Ehrlich:

Behold, days are coming—declares the Lord—when I will deal with every circumcised person possessing a foreskin: with Egypt, with Judah, with Edom, with the Ammonites, with Moab, and with all those shaven at the temple who live in the desert. For all of the nations have foreskins, and all of the House of Israel have foreskins of the heart.

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., the evidence adduced by M. Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21–37* (New York: Doubleday, 1997) 661–62, 666.

<sup>4</sup> Today, Greenberg (*Ezekiel 21–37*, 661–62, 666) sees no contradiction between the biblical and the extrabiblical evidence, but thirty years ago he assumed that the evidence of Jeremiah and perhaps Ezekiel was “in conflict with the evidence of Egyptian texts and pictorial representations of circumcision (*ANET* 326) and Herodotus . . .”; M. Greenberg, *Understanding Exodus* (New York: Behrman House, 1969) 41. See also E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)* (rev. and ed. G. Vermes and F. Millar; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1973) 1.538: “. . . Jer. 9,24–5, according to the correct interpretation of the passage, indicates that the Egyptians were uncircumcised.”

<sup>5</sup> See J. H. Michaelis, *Biblia Hebraica*, 413; J. D. Michaelis, *Observationes Philologicae et Criticae in Jeremiae Vaticinia et Threnos* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1793) 90–91; idem, *Commentaries on the Laws of Moses* (London: Rivington, 1814) 3.69–93. The classical and patristic sources have of course been discussed many times since the eighteenth century; see E. M. Smallwood, “The Legislation of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius against Circumcision,” *Latomus* 18 (1959) 334–47; C. de Wit, “La circoncision chez les anciens Egyptiens,” *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 99 (1972) 41–48, and the literature cited there in nn. 25 and 62; Schürer, *History*, 1.537–40.

• • •

On the literary level, we have the kind of envelope pattern known in rabbinic literature as כלל ופרט וכלל, “generalization, specification, generalization.”<sup>8</sup> The clearest

<sup>8</sup> See W. Bacher, *Die exegetische Terminologie der jüdischen Traditionsliteratur* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1905) 1.80; 2.83–84; M. Chernick, במדרשם ומעוטן ״רבינו וכלל״ לחקר המידות (Lod: Habermann Institute for Literary Research, 1984); and (for the *Barayta de Rabbi Yishmael*) L. Finkelstein, *Sifra on Leviticus* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1983–) 2.3, 6;

examples consist of a phrase containing the word כל that denotes a set of objects or kinds of objects, followed by a list of members of the set (e.g., Exod 39:33–40) or some representative members of it (e.g., Exod 22:8, Lev 14:9, and Deut 14:26), followed by a second (resumptive) phrase that again contains the word כל and denotes the entire set.

Jeremiah employs this structure in 9:24–25 and 25:17–26. In both of these examples, the structure is slightly skewed, the second כלל being more general than the first,<sup>9</sup> but this has little importance. For our purposes, the central point is that the nations listed in 9:25 are included in both כללים, the first (בְּעֶרְלָהּ) and the second (בְּלִי-חַיִּים).

The exegetical history of Jer 9:24–25—from Rashi (eleventh century) to J. D. Michaelis (eighteenth century) and finally to Ehrlich (nineteenth century)—can be viewed in terms of these structural clues. All of these exegetes had the same understanding of the phrase בְּעֶרְלָהּ, but the historical information needed to reconcile that understanding with the structure of the passage became available only gradually.

Rashi took בְּעֶרְלָהּ as a reference to those who were circumcised physically but not spiritually:

כל מול שיש—every circumcised person that has a foreskin (בְּעֶרְלָהּ), even a foreskin of the heart. All the more so, the uncircumcised. (לו ערלה)<sup>10</sup>

This interpretation assumes that the preposition ב- means “with” in the possessive sense, as in Gen 9:4, בָּשָׂר בְּנֶפֶשׁ, “flesh with [= possessing] its life”; Job 19:20, בְּעוֹר שֵׁנִי, “(I escaped) with [= possessing] the skin of my teeth”—to cite only examples involving human flesh.<sup>11</sup> According to the rabbinic interpretation of Lev 21:13, אִשָּׁה בְּכַוְלֶיהָ, viz., “a woman with [= possessing] her maidenhead,”<sup>12</sup> בְּכַוְלֶיהָ is a close semantic parallel to בְּעֶרְלָהּ. Thus, Rashi’s paraphrase “every circumcised person that has a foreskin” is equivalent to “every circumcised person with [= possessing] a foreskin.”<sup>13</sup>

3.3, 17–18; 4.8–9. This is certainly one of the earliest descriptions of the envelope pattern and deserves to be noted as such by historians of literary criticism. For a discussion of this device in poetry, see S. F. Fogle, “Envelope Pattern,” in *Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics* (ed. F. J. Warnke and O. B. Hardison, Jr.; Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1974) 241–42. I am indebted to Joan Haahr for this reference and to James J. Paxson for additional clarifications and references.

<sup>9</sup> The rabbis were sensitive to this issue as well. In two places in the Talmud, Amoraim challenge the authenticity of a כלל ופרש וכלל on the grounds that “the first כלל does not resemble the second”; see Chernick, *לחקר המידות*, 30–32.

<sup>10</sup> I have translated the text printed in the Rabbinic Bible. Two thirteenth-century manuscripts (Oxford 186 and 295), collated at my request by Binyamin Richler of the Institute for Micro-filmed Hebrew Manuscripts of the Jewish National Library in Jerusalem, show only minor variants.

<sup>11</sup> This sense of ב- is especially common in prepositional phrases modifying verbs of motion, e.g., Gen 15:14, “they shall go out with [= possessing] great wealth”; 32:11, “with [= possessing] my staff alone I crossed this Jordan”—not to mention our example from Job 19:20. For further examples, see BDB.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. especially the paraphrase בחולים / כולו בחולים—עד דאיכה כל בחוליה—in *b. Yeb.* 59a and *b. Ket.* 97b.

<sup>13</sup> This paraphrase seems to be implicit already in *Midrash Yelammedenu* (to Lev 24:10): “What is (the meaning of) בְּעֶרְלָהּ? מול? That they were circumcised but restored the foreskin through epispasm.” Rashi takes the word עֶרְלָהּ in our passage as a concrete noun, basing his para-

Rashi apparently assumed that only the Jews were circumcised physically and thus that מִל בְּעֶרְלָה referred only to them. If so, his interpretation is problematic in that it ignores the apposition, discussed above, between the phrase “with every מִל בְּעֶרְלָה” and the phrase “with Egypt, with Judah, with Edom, with the Ammonites, with Moab, and with all those shaven at the temple who live in the desert.”

Rashi's paraphrase was adopted by J. D. Michaelis: *in omnem circumcisum, qui praeputium habet*.<sup>14</sup> However, this scholar was well aware that circumcision was practiced outside of Israel, among the Egyptians, Arabs, and others, and he therefore had no need to restrict מִל בְּעֶרְלָה to the Jews. He was thus able to account for the apposition mentioned above: all of the nations on the list, not just Judah, were circumcised physically but not spiritually.<sup>15</sup>

On the other hand, Michaelis saw only part of the כלל ופרט וכלל structure. Citing Jerome, he writes explicitly that the phrase קְלִי-הַנָּחִים, “all of the nations,” does not refer to the nations mentioned in the preceding list but to “all the rest of the nations and peoples.”<sup>16</sup>

It was not until A. B. Ehrlich that a modification of Rashi's interpretation was suggested that fully accounts for the structure of the passage:

מִל בְּעֶרְלָה—one that is circumcised and even so has a foreskin. The matter is explained in the other verse, for all of the nations mentioned there were circumcised and not circumcised, inasmuch as they were only semi-circumcised and their circumcision was not complete, and with reference to Israel it says this on account of the foreskin of their hearts.<sup>17</sup>

According to this interpretation, מִל בְּעֶרְלָה refers to all of the nations listed in v. 25, as required by the syntax of our passage. All of them are circumcised and, nonetheless, have a foreskin. In the case of the Egyptians, etc., the physical foreskin is not completely removed. In the case of the Jews, it is the spiritual foreskin surrounding their hearts (cf. Jer 4:4) that is the problem. The conclusion of the כלל ופרט וכלל structure, the assertion that “all of the nations have foreskins,” refers to those nations that are par-

---

phrase on Gen 34:14 “to a man who has a foreskin [עֶרְלָה]”. That is the only sense attested for the word and probably the only one ever considered by interpreters of our passage (with the exception of LXX?), but we cannot altogether rule out the possibility that it is an abstract noun referring to the state of having a foreskin, equivalent to the rabbinic term עֶרְלוּת (e.g., *b. Yeb.* 71a, 72a, 73a). This possibility is suggested by the *o* < *u* in the first syllable and especially by the similarity between עֶרְלָה-עֶרְלָה and עֶרְלָה-עֶרְלָה. An analogy between עֶרְלָה and עֶרְלָה would be very natural, since the two are paired in Isa 52:1 and very often in rabbinic literature. In this interpretation, עֶרְלָה would be equivalent to the NT phrase ἐν ἀκροβυστίαις, “in uncircumcision” (Rom 4:10–12; 1 Cor 7:18), and כָּל מִל בְּעֶרְלָה would mean “every circumcised person who is in a state of uncircumcision.” Compare the view expressed by S. J. D. Cohen: “Foreskin” is a metaphor for the ‘gentile state’; cf. *m. Ned.* 3.11 and *Eph.* 2.11 (“Is ‘Proselyte Baptism’ Mentioned in the Mishnah? The Interpretation of *M. Pesahim* 8.8 [= *M. Eduyot* 5.2],” in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* [ed. J. C. Reeves and J. Kampen; JSOTSup 184; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994] 289).

<sup>14</sup> J. D. Michaelis, *Observationes Philologicae*, 90.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 90–91.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 91.

<sup>17</sup> A. B. Ehrlich, *מקרא כפשוטו* (Berlin: M. Poppelauer, 1899–1901) 3.195.

tially circumcised, like the Egyptians, and perhaps also to those that are not circumcised at all, like the Philistines. It is difficult to understand why Ehrlich's interpretation has been ignored by all students of our passage, even Ehrlich himself.<sup>18</sup>

A similar conjecture concerning Egyptian circumcision was put forward in 1965 by E. Isaac in a study of circumcision in the Bible:

The kind of circumcision performed in the case of Abraham as well as in Egypt may well have been the incomplete circumcision Merker found among the Masai. Merker first suggested this possibility in an early study on the Masai. . . . In circumcision among the Masai the upper part of the glans is cut and the skin flaps are left hanging from the fraenum; the praeputium is thus not completely removed. The practice is found also among Chaga, Somalis and others in East Africa. Merker proposed that the "second circumcision" mentioned in the book of Joshua (5:2) refers to the completion of the operation, and the statement "This day I have rolled away the reproach of Egypt from off you" (Joshua 5:9) to the reproach constituted by circumcision performed in the Egyptian manner.<sup>19</sup>

Isaac pointed out that Merker's interpretation of Joshua's "second circumcision" is very similar to one cited by Rashi (and David Kimḥi) from the Talmud (*b. Yeb.* 71b): recircumcision was necessary because the original circumcision, performed in Egypt, was incomplete.<sup>20</sup> However, it is worth noting that the Talmud itself goes on to reject this suggestion on the grounds that, according to Josh 5:4–7, Joshua circumcised only those Israelites born in the desert, who had never before been circumcised.

This interpretation of Joshua 5 was proposed once again in 1966 by J. M. Sasson:

Vs. 2 consists of a command issued to Joshua: "Make for yourselves knives of flint and circumcise *again* the children of Israel the *second time*." Some have thought that this passage has been altered by a later editor to harmonize it with other references in the Bible. But in the light of the foregoing, this can now be explained as an injunction for those who have accepted an Egyptian

<sup>18</sup> See A. B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1912) 4.268, where he emends the text.

<sup>19</sup> E. Isaac, "Circumcision as Covenant Rite," *Anthropos* 59 (1965) 453. Isaac's attribution to Merker of the conjecture concerning Egyptian circumcision is inaccurate. According to Merker's suggestion, the Israelites had a Masai-style circumcision, but the Egyptians, who considered such circumcision shameful, did not; see M. Merker, *Die Masai* (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1904) 319–20.

<sup>20</sup> The complete operation required by Jewish law (*m. Shab.* 19:6) is described in *EncJud* 5.571: "the foreskin is amputated with one sweep along the shield. This discloses the mucous membrane, the edge of which is then grasped firmly between the thumbnail and the index finger of each hand and is torn down the center as far as the corona." A nineteenth-century description of the circumcision of Algerian Arabs is strikingly similar: "the prepuce is removed at one sweep; the mucous inner layer is then lacerated with the thumb-nails and turned back over to join the other parts" (P. C. Remondino, *History of Circumcision from the Earliest Times to the Present* [Philadelphia/London: F. A. Davis, 1891] 38; I am indebted to Edward Reichman for this reference). Rashi's view is that the original circumcision omitted the second step, known as פיריטה. Isaac's translation of Rashi renders this Hebrew term inaccurately as "the tearing off [of the praeputium]"; his later explanation of the term as "complete exposure of the glans" is better.

circumcision to "improve" on the ritual by undergoing a thorough removal of the foreskin. In this context, God's remark in vs. 9 becomes clearer. When the deed was accomplished, he states: "This day I have rolled away the reproach of Egypt from off you."<sup>21</sup>

Sasson pointed to F. Jonckheere's study of Egyptian circumcision as the basis for this interpretation of Josh 5:2.<sup>22</sup> In my view, that study has more to say about Jer 9:24–25. It provides stunning confirmation of Ehrlich's theory, by showing that Egyptian circumcision was quite different from that of the Jews.<sup>23</sup> Jewish circumcision involves pulling the foreskin forward and amputating it; the removal of an annular piece of skin permanently uncovers the glans.<sup>24</sup> The Egyptian procedure involved either the excision of a triangular section from the dorsal face of the foreskin or simply a longitudinal incision along the median line of the dorsal face allowing retraction of the foreskin and exposure of the glans.<sup>25</sup> In the Egyptian context, then, the terms מִל, "having an uncovered glans," and עָרַל, "having a foreskin," are not contradictory. The Egyptian of Jeremiah's time was literally a מִל שֵׁשׁ לוֹ עָרַלָה, to use Rashi's paraphrase.

What about the Idumeans? According to a new reading of Josephus, *Ant.* 13.9.1 §§257–58 suggested by Morton Smith,<sup>26</sup> they too were circumcised in a way different from the Jews. Smith translates the passage as follows:

And of Idumea Hyrcanus takes the cities Adora and Marisa. And having subjugated all the Idumeans, he permitted them to remain in the land if they would be circumcised and consent to use the laws of the Jews. And they, from desire of their ancestral land, undertook to make the circumcision and the other way of life the same as the Jews.

<sup>21</sup> J. M. Sasson, "Circumcision in the Ancient Near East," *JBL* 85 (1966) 474.

<sup>22</sup> F. Jonckheere, "La circonsion [sic] des anciens Egyptiens," *Centaurus* 1 (1951) 212–34.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., 225–28; Sasson, "Circumcision," 473–76; de Wit, "La circonsion," 46; J. F. Nunn, *Ancient Egyptian Medicine* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996) 169–71. (I am indebted to Robert K. Ritner for the last reference and the next reference.) Jonckheere's conclusion has been challenged by P. Ghalioungui, *Magic and Medical Science in Ancient Egypt* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1963) 96–97; however, it is difficult to understand how Ghalioungui can rely on Strabo's testimony concerning circumcision after he himself has impeached that testimony a few lines before. Although Sasson's article does not mention Jer 9:24–25, it is cited in connection with those verses by Holladay, *Jeremiah* 1, 319 n. 1; P. C. Craigie, P. H. Kelley, and J. F. Drinkard, *Jeremiah* 1–25 (Dallas: Word Books, 1991) 153; and F. B. Huey, *Jeremiah, Lamentations* (Nashville: Broadman, 1993) 122 n. 33. However, none of these scholars actually used the article to interpret the passage.

<sup>24</sup> See J. Snowman, *The Surgery of Ritual Circumcision* (London: Initiation Society, 1962) 28–30; E. A. Grossman, *Circumcision* (Great Neck, NY: Todd & Honeywell, 1982).

<sup>25</sup> Jonckheere, "La circonsion," 225–26. It is not possible to decide between the two possibilities based on the available evidence; both procedures explain the form of the dehiscence depicted on statues. The incision method is attested among many tribes all over the world, while excision of a triangular section is described by the Roman medical writer, A. C. Celsus, and reported in modern times for the Tatars; see Jonckheere, "La circonsion," 225; and L. H. Gray, "Circumcision (Introductory)," in *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* (ed. J. Hastings; 13 vols.; New York: Scribner's, 1958) 3.660 (both cols.).

<sup>26</sup> M. Smith, *The Cult of Yahweh* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 273.

He adds the following explanation:

I have translated literally to show the ambiguities of the passage. It can be read in two ways: (1) "To make their circumcision" (which they already practiced) "and the rest of their way of life the same as the Jews'." . . . Alternatively, (2) "To practice circumcision" (which they had not heretofore practiced) "and to make the rest of their way of life the same as the Jews'." . . . The second is the common interpretation, but the first is supported by a parallel in Strabo.<sup>27</sup>

Modern students of Josephus, aware only of reading (2), have judged Josephus's report to be untrue or half-true.<sup>28</sup> Reading (1) allows us to take the report at face value: the Edomites practiced circumcision but not the way the Jews did.

• • •

It has been plausibly suggested that Jeremiah's aim in this prophecy is the same as his goal in the Temple Sermon (chap. 7): to demolish the illusory psychological refuges of his countrymen.<sup>29</sup> The people of Judah prided themselves on bearing the sign of the Lord's covenant with Abraham, and they relied on it to protect them from the destruction to be visited on the uncircumcised nations.<sup>30</sup> Nations like Egypt and Edom could not boast of possessing this special status, because their circumcision was incomplete. In all likelihood, the phrase *מִלּוֹ בְּעֶרְלָה* was a popular expression used in Jeremiah's time to underscore the difference between the circumcised Egyptian, Edomite, etc. and the true *מִלּוֹ*, the Jew.<sup>31</sup>

Jeremiah's point is that the difference is imaginary: the circumcision of the Jews is

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., 273–74. Louis H. Feldman notes that the phrase that Smith renders "the circumcision and the other way of life" may be translated even more literally as "both (καὶ) the circumcision and (καὶ) the other way of life," and he believes there may be significance in "both . . . and" (personal communication). This observation strengthens reading (1), since it indicates that "to make/do the same as the Jews" applies equally to circumcision and the rest of their way of life. Both are to be *modified*, not *introduced*.

<sup>28</sup> U. Rappaport, "הערים ההלניסטיות וייהודה של ארץ ישראל בחקופת החשמונאים" in . . . דורון . . . בפעל השכפול (ed. S. Perlman and B. Shimron; Tel-Aviv: 1967) 229; A. Kasher, *Jews, Idumeans, and Ancient Arabs* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1988) 57. It is true that they base this judgment mainly on Jer 9:24–25 and Ezek 32:39, but Kasher (*Jews*, 56 n. 35) also cites a reference in the Zenon papyri to circumcised non-Jews in Palestine in 257 BCE, more than a century before John Hyrcanus assumed the high priesthood in 134 BCE. (I am indebted to Louis H. Feldman for the references to Kasher.)

<sup>29</sup> See Blackwood, *Commentary on Jeremiah*, 109; R. P. Carroll, *Jeremiah: A Commentary* (London: SCM, 1986) 252.

<sup>30</sup> Carroll, *Jeremiah*, 252.

<sup>31</sup> Jeremiah's sensitivity to popular political and theological expressions is not limited to explicit cases like Jer 31:29–30. I have pointed out less obvious examples in "The Two Sons of Neriah and the Two Editions of Jeremiah in the Light of Two *Atbash* Code-words for Babylon," VT 46 (1996) 83, and "A Colloquialism in Jer 5:13 from the Ancestor of Mishnaic Hebrew," JSS 37 (1992) 11–26.



also incomplete. In making this point, the prophet delivers two powerful jolts to the national psyche. Not only does he include Judah in a list of nations whose circumcision is incomplete, but, adding insult to injury, he arranges the list strictly on the basis of geography, with Judah sandwiched between Egypt and Edom rather than at the end of the list.<sup>32</sup> The arrangement conveys a subtle but unmistakable message: Judah does not deserve the climactic position at the end of the list, because its inclusion in the list is totally unremarkable and, hence, devoid of dramatic value. Its being labeled a *מִל בְּעֶרְלָה* is shocking only to those who live in a world of delusion.

Richard C. Steiner  
Yeshiva University, New York, NY 10033

<sup>32</sup> Or at least at the beginning of the list, as in Jer 25:18. Holladay considers this arrangement "the most remarkable single feature of the passage" (*Jeremiah 1*, 319), but the explanation he offers ignores the artistry of the passage.

## SELF-CONTRADICTION IN THE IQP

The publication of the first four volumes of *Documenta Q*<sup>1</sup> cannot fail to impress the reader with the enormous industry that has gone into the International Q Project. More than forty scholars have worked to amass the opinions of the learned over a century, to set out their reasons, and to provide an evaluation on every point at issue. The intention is within a limited period to publish a justified reconstruction of Q from start to finish; to judge from the present rate of progress, in about thirty volumes.

A student of Q myself, I have been anxious about so ambitious a scheme because there seems to be a concealed self-contradiction at its heart. I have tried to give warning of this problem for fifteen years: first in an essay, "A House Built on Sand,"<sup>2</sup> then in a full-length book, *Luke: A New Paradigm*,<sup>3</sup> and most recently in an article in *JBL*, "Is Q a Juggernaut?"<sup>4</sup> There have been two main papers on Q at recent meetings of the SNTS, and at both of them I have raised the difficulty; but neither Prof. Howard Kee at Prague nor Prof. Paul Hoffmann at Birmingham had apparently heard of it, nor did either attempt to answer it. I have felt like the clown in Kierkegaard who comes to warn the audience that the theater is on fire, and the more earnestly he speaks the louder they laugh. Perhaps a catalogue of specific instances will be less comical.

The IQP reconstruction of Q cites many arguments for preferring one or the other (or neither) of the forms in Matthew or Luke, but a principal criterion is that a word or phrase is characteristic of one of the evangelists, *and so is likely to be his redaction*. We meet this argument repeatedly, and it must dominate the discussion in every volume. I

<sup>1</sup> *Documenta Q: Reconstructions of Q through Two Centuries of Gospel Research Excerpted, Sorted and Evaluated* (Leuven: Peeters): S. Carruth and A. Garsky, *Q 11:2b-4* (ed. S. D. Anderson, 1996); S. Carruth and J. M. Robinson, *Q 4:1-13, 16: The Temptations of Jesus; Nazara* (ed. C. Heil, 1997); A. Garsky, C. Heil, T. Hieke, and J. E. Amon, *Q 12:49-59: Children against Parents; Judging the Time; Settling out of Court* (ed. S. Carruth, 1997); P. Hoffmann et al., *Q 12:8-12: Confessing and Denying; Speaking against the Holy Spirit; Hearings before Authorities* (ed. C. Heil, 1997). The authors cited include nineteenth-century scholars, but almost all the citations are from the past century.

<sup>2</sup> The essay was delivered to the British section of SNTS at its Edinburgh Conference in 1983, and published in *Alternative Approaches to New Testament Study* (ed. A. E. Harvey; London: SPCK, 1985) 1-24.

<sup>3</sup> 2 vols.; JSNTSup 20; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.

<sup>4</sup> *JBL* 115/4 (1996) 667-81. The article touches on the problem of self-contradiction in Q studies (pp. 671-72), but limits itself to three brief illustrations; the present essay attempts a full account of the issue.

may limit citation to James Robinson on the first phrase in the Lord's Prayer, where Luke's is *πάτερ* is preferred to Matthew's *πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*.<sup>5</sup> "Matthew (Matt 7:11) presents the familiar Matthean form used in the Prayer . . . the Matthean preference for 'Father *who art in heaven*' . . . the typically Matthean alternative [viz. ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς] in Matt 5:45."<sup>6</sup> Matthew uses the phrase twelve times, eleven of them redactionally, according to Ulrich Luz.<sup>7</sup> it comes once in Mark and never in Luke. So it is the familiar, preferred, typical Matthean form, *and so likely to be Matthew's redaction*.

A second, related argument is used to justify the same conclusion: the Matthean wording is typically Jewish, *and so likely to be Matthew's redaction*. Adolf Harnack is cited as saying that "who art in heaven" and other Matthean phrases are "Zusätze, die sich die judenchristlichen Urgemeinden gestattet haben" in solemn recital at prayer.<sup>8</sup> T. W. Manson similarly wrote, "Mt's phrase is an adaptation of the original 'Father' to conform to Jewish liturgical usage."<sup>9</sup> The unstated argument here stems from Matthew's obvious Jewishness. Matthew's was a Jewish-Christian community, presumably familiar with Jewish liturgy, so any forms reminiscent of Jewish liturgy *are likely to be Matthean redaction*.

Behind this often repeated appeal to characteristic Matthean language and thought lies an unstated criterion: *Q's language and thought were different from Matthew's*. For of course if Q's language and Matthew's were similar, Robinson's argument would not work. If on other grounds it appeared that Q and Matthew had similar styles, either because they were both rather Jewish, or because they lived in the same area,<sup>10</sup> or the same decade,<sup>11</sup> or for any other reason, then the presence of ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς in Matt 6:9 would suggest that *the phrase was in Q*, and not the opposite. The same would go for Harnack and Manson. If on other grounds it appeared that Q was a thoroughly Jewish-Christian document, then the presence of Jewish liturgical phrasing in the Matthean form would suggest that *the phrase was in Q*, and not the opposite. It is worthwhile asking, therefore, where these criteria come from, that Q's language and thought were so different from Matthew's; and the answer is that they come as presuppositions and have no basis at all. I have never seen them argued for (or even stated).

It is not beyond our powers to find evidence for Q's background and language, for we have some 1,800 Q words in which Matthew and Luke agree (I give such words the

<sup>5</sup> It would be just as logical here to prefer the Matthean formulation since Luke writes "*πάτερ*" six times elsewhere ("Father, forgive them," "Father, into thy hands," "Father, I have sinned," etc.; 22:42R), so it is likely to be *his* redaction. I should argue, and have in fact argued, for this conclusion (Luz, 496).

<sup>6</sup> Q 11:2b-4, 105.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., 103.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., 100.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., 101.

<sup>10</sup> Paul Hoffmann argues for this ("The Redaction of Q and the Son of Man: A Preliminary Sketch," in *The Gospel behind the Gospels* [ed. R. A. Piper; NovTSup 75; Leiden/New York/Cologne: Brill 1995] 197).

<sup>11</sup> Ibid. See also M. Myllykoski, "The Social History of Q and the Jewish War," in *Symbols and Strata* (ed. R. Uro; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997) 144-99.

siglum QC, Q words common to the two Gospels);<sup>12</sup> and these are our only certain basis of argument. Eighteen hundred words, about half of all the Q material, are not a lot, but it is what we have, and we must start from there. We may employ further arguments based on Q words where Matthew and Luke differ (QD), arguments that do not use the criteria set out above; but these will be less certain. However, we are considering the IQP and are in a position to use its own critical text as a basis for criticizing it.<sup>13</sup> Now a clear conclusion emerges from these QC words, and the QD passages I have just mentioned: *Q is very similar to Matthew in both phrasing and thought*. The corollary of this must be: *therefore any Matthean phrase is likely to be original to Q*. This is exactly the opposite of the criterion that is in fact being applied in the IQP.

This close similarity of Q to Matthew is most easily seen if we limit ourselves to phrases rather than to single words: the latter involve problems of definition as to what is to count as Matthean, whereas combinations of words often make the point without raising such questions.<sup>14</sup> For instance, a striking clause common to Matthew and Q is the following:

- (1) ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων (6/01Q—0)<sup>15</sup>

This occurs in Matt 13:42, 50; 22:13; 24:51; 25:30, all in the conclusion of M parables. But it also occurs in Matt 8:12/Luke 13:28 and is therefore a clause in use by Q also. However, the Lukan form seems to be clumsy. It follows the rebuke, "Depart from me, all you workers of iniquity," so that there is no referent for ἐκεῖ; the following ὅταν fits ἐκεῖ uneasily, and Luke ends with ὑμᾶς δὲ ἐκβαλλομένους ἔξω. Matthew, however, has a strong referent for ἐκεῖ in the preceding ἐκβληθήσονται εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον. The IQP therefore prudently accepts the Matthean order, while bashfully leaving the wording open with [[ ]] ἐκβ . . λ[[ηθήσ(εσθε)]<sup>16</sup>] . . ἔξω . . ἐκεῖ ἔσται κτλ. They have confidence only in the unbracketed letters. There is a reward here for indecision: Athanasius Polag, in his edition of Q, accepts not only the Matthean order but the full Matthean wording (still possible for the IQP) with its "outer darkness: *there shall*

<sup>12</sup> There are about the same number of words usually attributed to Q but where the forms differ in Matthew and Luke: I give these the symbol QD. I use R (for redaction) to mark the later evangelists' alterations to Mark (assumed to be prior to them both). M is for material found only in Matthew, L for that found only in Luke: M and L are not assumed to stand for independent sources.

<sup>13</sup> The form of text agreed by the IQP to be original to Q was published annually in *JBL* between 1989 and 1997. It includes a certain amount of indecision and marginal decision as well as a good deal of bold decision and exclusion.

<sup>14</sup> For a critique of earlier work I did, based on word counts, see M. S. Goodacre, *Goulder and the Gospels: An Examination of a New Paradigm* (JSNTSup 133; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996). The first section of the book exposes an embarrassing number of errors and counter-arguments that I had missed; but Goodacre still thinks I was right about Q.

<sup>15</sup> I use this form of figures to signify: usages in Matthew/Mark/Luke(Q)—the rest of the NT. The similar form with + signifies the standard Matt/Mark/Luke + Acts.

<sup>16</sup> The small IQP brackets signal that the letters εσθε are in neither Matthew nor Luke but have been introduced without authority to give syntax to the hypothetical reconstruction.

be . . . ”<sup>17</sup> But the price of consistency would be an even more impressive sequence of words common to Q and Matthew, for the outer darkness comes again in Matt 22:13 and 24:51 (both times with ἐκβάλετε), and nowhere else in the NT.

Hell is in fact an important feature of Q, as it is of Matthew: it is not just the words but the concept that they have in common. This is especially evidenced in the Baptist’s preaching section, where the QC words form over 90 percent of the total. John says (Matt 3:7/Luke 3:7):

(2) γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, (τίς ὑπέδειξεν ὑμῖν . . . ); (3/0/1Q—0)

Matthew is fond of comparing those of whom he disapproves to animals: snakes, dogs, pigs, wolves. Twice elsewhere he uses the abusive animal vocative γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν followed by a rhetorical question: γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, πῶς δύνασθε . . . ; (12:34QD); γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, πῶς φύγητε . . . ; (23:33M). In the second case the rhetorical question is about hell, and the same is true of Q’s question. Indeed, the wording of the rhetorical Q question seems to be echoed in Matt 23:33M:

(3) . . . τίς ὑπέδειξεν ὑμῖν φυγεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς μελλούσης ὀργῆς;  
. . . πῶς φύγητε ἀπὸ τῆς κρίσεως τῆς γεέννης;

These are the only two times that φυγεῖν ἀπὸ occurs in the NT of escaping from hell—once in Q, once in M—both times in a rhetorical question. It is significant that both Q and Matthew should have spent so much time meditating on the fate of the damned, for hell is absent from the writings of Paul and John, who prefer vague expressions like perishing. Mark has a single passage on Gehenna in 9:43–48, and Luke limits it to wealthy non-Christian hypocrites: but a number of baptized Christians end up there in Q (Matt 24:45–51/Luke 12:41–46), as in Matthew (22:10–14; 25:1–13).

The Baptist compares the Jewish leaders to unfruitful trees, and this provides us with a further example of Q’s similarities to Matthew, in that the two have a whole sentence in common:

(4) πᾶν δένδρον μὴ ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλὸν ἐκκόπτεται καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλεται  
(Matt 3:10/Luke 3:9Q; Matt 7:19QD)

The IQP does not attribute Matt 7:19 to Q, so it either came from Matthew’s source or was Matthew’s own redaction. How singular that the same succession of eleven words should be found in the same order in Q! The idea of casting (βάλλειν) the wicked into the (furnace of) fire (εἰς πῦρ) recurs in Matt 13:42M; 13:50M (alone in the NT outside the Apocalypse). The combination ἐκκόπτειν καὶ βάλλειν comes again in Matthew at 18:8R and 5:30M. ποιοῦν καρπὸν is also a phrase shared more widely by Matthew and Q: Matthew has it in 7:17QD (2); 7:19QD (2); 12:33QD (2); 13:26M; while it is in QC in Matt 3:8, 10/Luke 3:8–9; Matt 7:18 (2)/Luke 6:43 (2). Luke also has the phrase in 8:8R; 13:9L; but John uses φέρειν and Mark prefers διδόναι or καρποφορεῖν, so it is not just a standard expression with no alternative.

<sup>17</sup> A. Polag, *Fragmenta Q: Textheft zur Logienquelle* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1979).

Matthew has rather a black-and-white view of eternal judgment, which shows itself in straightforward adjectival contrasts:

- (5) καλός . . . σαπρός (5/0/2Q—0: Matt 12:33QD (2); 13:48M)  
 ἀγαθός . . . πονηρός (11/0/5Q—0: 5:45; 7:17, 18; 12:34; 20:15; 22:10, all M)  
 φρόνιμος . . . μωρός (4/0/0—0; 7:24/26; 25:1–13)

But these contrasts were also congenial to Q. Q has καλός . . . σαπρός in Matt 7:17–18/Luke 6:43 (2); and ἀγαθός . . . πονηρός in Matt 12:35(3)/Luke 6:45 (3); Matt 7:11/Luke 11:13; Matt 25:21–26/Luke 19:17–22. Most of these passages refer either to good and bad people directly, or to good and bad, fine and rotten trees and fruit, treasures and treasure chests, which symbolize people. They are all part of the imagery of judgment and hell. But Q lacks the wise/foolish contrast.

Not all of the harvest is wasted, of course, and the Baptist ends his sermon:

- (6) συνάξει τὸν σῖτον αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην, as opposed to the chaff, which he will burn (κατακαύσει) (Matt 3:12/Luke 3:17Q). Later Matthew will tell the parable of the tares, when the master bids his servants to burn (κατακαύσαι) the weeds, but adds:

τὸν δὲ σῖτον συναγάγετε εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην μου (13:30M)

Again we have quite a long clause in common between Q and Matthew, this time covering heaven as well as hell. Someone might think that Matthew was borrowing such sentences and phrases from Q; or perhaps it was the other way round.

Matthew is fond of similes and parables and may introduce his similes of doom and their expected fulfillment with the following form:

- (7) ὥστερ . . . οὕτως ἔσται . . . (4/0/2Q—0)

Matthew uses this form of words for the sign of Jonah (12:40QD, which the IQP does not allow to be Q), and at 13:40M in the parable of the tares. But Q also uses this form in Matt 24:27/Luke 17:24 (where both Gospels have ὥστερ), and in Matt 24:37/Luke 17:26 (where Luke has his preferred καθώς, but the IQP attributes ὥστερ with a probability of C to Q). Q will also have used the similar ὅπου . . . ἐκεῖ ἔσται (Matt 6:21/Luke 21:34).

Another form that Matthew likes for opening a parable is the following:

- (8) ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία (τῶν οὐρανῶν) (6/0/2Q—0)

He uses this in 13:44, 45, 47 and 20:1, all M parables; but Q also uses the ὁμοία ἐστὶν form in Matt 13:31, 33/Luke 13:19, 21, though in Luke's Gospel it is as usual ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. Q also has the same phrase with "this generation" in Matt 11:14/Luke 7:32.

We may close the features of coming judgment common to Matthew and Q with a broader category. Matthew is fond of

- (9) *Converse Principles of Judgment*, which lay down, somewhat in the manner of legislation, what will follow certain human behavior, and then the converse.

Therefore, whoever breaks one of the least of these commandments, and teaches others to do the same, will be called least in the kingdom of heaven; but whoever does them and teaches them will be called great in the kingdom of heaven. (Matt 5:19M)

For if you forgive others their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you; but if you do not forgive others, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses. (Matt 6:14–15M)

For by your words you will be justified, and by your words you will be condemned. (Matt 12:37M)

And whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven. (Matt 16:19M)

The same sentence comes in the plural form in 18:18M. We find a pronouncement in closely similar form in Q:

Everyone therefore who acknowledges me before others, I [Matt]/the Son of Man [Luke] also will acknowledge before my Father in heaven [Matt]/the angels of God [Luke]; but whoever denies me before others, I also will deny [Matt]/he will be denied [Luke] before my Father who is in heaven [Matt]/the angels of God [Luke]. (Matt 10:32–33/Luke 12:8–9Q—the IQP leaves the decision open)

We may add two further examples which have the same converse form and are only less directly principles of judgment:

Either make the tree good, and its fruit good; or make the tree bad, and its fruit bad. (Matt 12:33M)

If then your eye be generous, your whole body [[is]] full of light; but if your eye be mean, your whole body [[is]] dark. (Matt 6:23/Luke 11:34QC)

If we include the last two passages, we have six such converse principles of judgment in Matthew in addition to the two in Q. They are among the most significant of the stylistic common features of Q and Matthew, as they stick out not only as carefully antithetical warnings of the relation between human and divine action but also by their virtual absence from Mark or L.

There is a parallel in Mark (4:25 = Matt 13:12/Luke 8:18):

For to those who have, more will be given; and from those who have nothing, even what they have will be taken away.

But the difference from Q/Matthew is not hard to see. Q and Matthew want to let you know how you will stand if you behave in such a way, and what will happen if you behave in the opposite way. If you want to go to heaven, you must keep and teach the whole OT Torah, forgive offenses, confess your faith in Christ, and live a fruitful life in terms clearly laid down in the Sermon; and if you do not do these things, you will end up in the other place. God will ratify any rulings made by Peter and the Twelve, whether binding or loosing. But the Markan parallel leaves us with just a riddle, which the context does

nothing to resolve. Matthew resolves it, because Matthew is like that. He gives the saying again at the end of the parable of the talents in Matt 25:29: God gives us a trust here, and if we are profitable servants we will "have abundance" (in heaven); if we are not we shall lose what we have here and go into outer darkness.<sup>18</sup>

There are other examples of converse logia in Luke, but they all differ from the judgment pronouncement form in Q/Matthew:

Whoever is faithful in a very little is faithful also in much, and whoever is dishonest in a very little is dishonest also in much. (Luke 16:10)

This is a general statement on human nature.

From everyone to whom much has been given, much will be required; and from the one to whom much has been entrusted, even more will be demanded. (12:48bL)

Although this is about judgment, it is not a converse statement but an intensification in the second line. Luke also has approximations to the form in 7:47 (but the first half refers only to the woman), and in 12:47–48: 12:47–48a are about "that servant" in the parable and are not quite like Matthew's general principles.

Matthew has some other interests besides judgment, and he tends to soften Mark's critical view of the disciples; one means to this end is the use of an apparent neologism:

(10) ὀλιγόπιστοι (4/0/1Q—0)

The word is not found in Greek literature before Matthew. In addition, he uses the noun ὀλιγοπιστία in 17:20R, where Mark implies that the Twelve had not even faith as a grain of mustard seed. Similarly in 8:26R he has Jesus say, "Why are you scared, little-faiths?" where Mark had "Do you have no faith yet?"; and in 16:8R he inserts, "Why do you reason *among yourselves*, little-faiths?" In 14:31M he writes on his own, "Why did you doubt, little-faith?" But it appears that Q had got hold of this new word before Matthew, for we find, "Will he not much more [clothe] you, ὀλιγόπιστοι?" (Matt 6:30/Luke 12:28). What is so striking is that both Matthew and Q seem regularly to place the word in the vocative as the last word in a reproachful, if somewhat playful, rhetorical question. Perhaps Q wished to soften Mark's stern view of the apostles also.

Matthew uses many expressions that have no obvious doctrinal edge. One of these is to couple

(11) ἄνθρωπος with a noun (6/0/1Q—0)

We find ἄνθρωπος οἰκοδεσπότης in 13:52M; 20:1M; 21:33R; and ἄνθρωπος βασιλεὺς in 18:23M and 22:2QD: the surprising "a householder man," "a king man." But Q also uses it: he has ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης in Matt 11:19/Luke 7:34, "a glutton and a drunkard man." φάγος and οἰνοπότης are both nouns. Luke has the similar ἄνδρες

<sup>18</sup> The saying comes twice in Luke too, first in the Markan context (Luke 8:18), and then at the end of the parable of the pounds (Luke 19:26). As the Lukan parable of the pounds is so close to the Matthean parable of the talents, it is assigned by the IQP to Q.



Νινευῖται in 11:32QD and ἀνὴρ προφήτης at 24:19L, but the Q/Matthean use is with ἄνθρωπος, which is not the same.<sup>19</sup>

Matthew likes traditional Jewish phrases (as Harnack and Manson said), among them the following:

(12) ὁ ἀδελφός σου/αὐτοῦ, used not of a blood brother or Christian brother but of a fellow human being (12/0/4Q—0). He has this in 5:22 (2), 23, 24M; 5:47QD; 18:15QD (2); 18:35. But the phrase is also not uncommon in Q: it occurs in Matt 7:3, 4, 5/Luke 6:41–43 (3), and in Matt 18:21/Luke 17:3.

We also find

(13) ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων (5/0/2Q—0)

Matthew has this in 5:16; 6:1; and 23:13QD, but it also occurs in Q in Matt 10:32/Luke 12:8 and Matt 10:33 (IQP). The parallel of Matt 10:32–33Q with Matt 6:1M is evident: in both cases there is a contrast between “before humans” and before God (Matthew: “before my Father in heaven”; Luke: “before the angels of God”). Of the two words for “before,” Matthew shows a strong preference for ἔμπροσθεν (18/2/7:27:11R), where Luke likes ἐνώπιον (0/0/22 + 13: 5:18R, 25R). In Matt 10:33/Luke 12:9 Luke has his favorite ἐνώπιον, while Q (according to the IQP) agrees with Matthew.

It is also worth citing the full clause:

(14) εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ (3/0/2Q—0)

Q has the clause twice in the mouth of the devil in Matt 4:3, 6/Luke 4:3, 9, while Matthew also adds it in the mouth of mockers at the crucifixion in 27:40R. It seems that he knew the clause from Q. We also have the similar clause as a minor agreement in the Sanhedrin trial, where Matthew has it as an indirect question:

... ἡμῖν εἴπῃς εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (Matt 26:63)

... εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς, εἶπον ἡμῖν (Luke 22:67)

The frequency and impressiveness of minor agreements in the passion narrative raise the suspicion that Q may have been at work here too.

I will close this list of locutions common to Q and Matthew with two tests on a broader front,

(15) *Cliché Pairs*.

Almost everyone makes use of standard pairs: ladies and gentlemen, life and death, etc.<sup>20</sup> Mark has them at the rate of one or two per chapter (ca. 750 words): sinners and publicans, Tyre and Sidon, fetters and chains, in fear and trembling, weeping and wailing, father and mother. Luke is fonder of them: in the L passages in Luke 3–21<sup>21</sup> we find

<sup>19</sup> Cf Goodacre, *Goulder and the Gospels*, 67.

<sup>20</sup> For simplicity I have limited the discussion here to pairs joined by the words *and* and *or*.

<sup>21</sup> I have excluded the passion and the infancy narratives as untypical: the former has few such pairs, the latter more than average insofar as it is a pastiche on the LXX. There are also questions over sources in both areas.

town and village, preaching and evangelizing, serpents and scorpions, oil and wine, judge and divider, ox and ass, streets and lanes, highways and hedges, publicans and sinners, friends and neighbors (male and female), music and dancing, purple and fine linen, Moses and the prophets (2), eating and drinking (2). That is seventeen instances in 4,326 words, as counted by Robert Morgenthaler in his *Statistische Synopse*,<sup>22</sup> or about one in 250 words.

Now Matthew is a great lover of the cliché pair: scribes and Pharisees, Pharisees and Sadducees, preaching and teaching, towns and villages, every sickness and every disease, weeping and gnashing of teeth, heaven and earth, the Law and the Prophets, the child and his mother. Matthew does not just lapse into them; he writes the same ones again and again. Perhaps "scribes and Pharisees" was not a pair in general use, but he has made it so. In his overwriting of Mark and Q he introduces them: forty days and forty nights, hunger and thirst, the day and the hour, women and children, three days and three nights, this age or the age to come.

So the test must be: if Q is like Matthew in style, as I have been arguing, we should expect a frequent use of cliché pairs, at least more frequent than in Mark and Luke (L); but if Q differs from Matthew in style, as is assumed by the IQP, we should expect fewer of them, perhaps something like Mark or L. I find the following pairs in QC: heaven and earth (Matt 5:18/Luke 16:17), sow nor reap (Matt 6:26/Luke 12:24), eat and drink (Matt 6:31/Luke 12:29), the Law and the Prophets (Matt 11:13/Luke 16:16), eating and drinking, glutton and drunkard, publicans and sinners (Matt 11:19/Luke 7:34), Tyre and Sidon (2), sackcloth and ashes (Matt 11:21–22/Luke 10:13–14), wise and understanding (Matt 11:25/Luke 10:21), swept and garnished (Matt 12:44/Luke 11:25), eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage (Matt 24:38/Luke 17:27). That gives fourteen instances in 1,800 words, or about one in 130 words, nearly twice the average in Luke 3–21.

A further broader area of distinctive writing is imagery. An author's mind tends to find certain groups of images congenial, and I have already noted how Q and Matthew use offensive animal images. But even more striking are

- (16) *Pairs of Animal Images* (10/0/4Q—0), which occur relatively frequently in both authors with symbolic force.

Matthew has: "Give not what is holy to dogs, and cast not your pearls before swine" (7:6); "who come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves" (7:15); "so be wise as serpents and innocent as doves" (10:16); "you strain out a gnat but swallow a camel" (23:24); "you snakes, you brood of vipers" (23:33); "as a shepherd separates the sheep from the goats" (25:32). Q has: "If he asks for a fish, will he give him a snake?" (Matt 7:10/Luke 11:11); "Foxes have holes, and birds of the air have nests" (Matt 8:20/Luke 9:58); "I am sending you out as sheep/lambs in the midst of wolves" (Matt 10:16/Luke 10:3); "as a hen gathers her chicks/nest under her wings" (Matt 23:37/Luke 13:34). This evidence on its own would be sufficient to show how close are Matthew's and Q's thinking. It cannot be an accident that a trait of this kind appears so often in these two authors, and never once in Mark or L or John.

<sup>22</sup> Zurich/Stuttgart: Gotthelf Verlag, 1971.

(17) I conclude with a final point of a slightly different kind. After the Sermon we find a notorious parallel:

καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους, ἐξεπλήσσαντο οἱ ὄχλοι (Matt 7:28) . . . εἰσελθόντος δὲ αὐτοῦ εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ (Matt.8:5)

ἐπειδὴ ἐπλήρωσεν πάντα τὰ ῥήματα αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς ἀκοὰς τοῦ λαοῦ, εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ (Luke 7:1)

This presents the Q hypothesis with a problem, which the IQP resolves with:

. . . ἐ[[πλήρω]]σεν [[τοὺς λόγους τούτους]] εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ

The false criteria which the IQP is using pose a series of impossible dilemmas. (i) Matthew closes all his five major discourses with a formula almost identical to the opening nine-word clause in 7:28: the words are the same at 19:1 and (with the addition of πάντας) at 26:1; with τὰς παραβολὰς ταύτας in 13:53, and with διατάσων τοῖς δώδεκα μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ in 11:1 in place of τοὺς λόγους τούτους. The whole clause looks like a characteristic Matthean locution, *and therefore Matthean redaction*. (ii) On the other hand, ἐπειδὴ comes only once in Matthew, never in Mark and five times in Luke-Acts, and ἐπειδήπερ in Luke 1:1 besides; so it looks distinctly Lukan, *and therefore likely to be Lukan redaction*. So the IQP takes discretion to be the better part of valor and prints “ . . . ”. (iii) The same dilemma comes in the next word, ἐπλήρωσεν in Luke, meaning *completed*, like ἐτέλεσεν in Matthew. πληροῦν is common in Matthew, where it almost always means *fulfill*, of the scriptures, and it is rare in Mark; but in Luke-Acts it frequently means *complete* (of times, days, Jesus’ exodus, etc.). So if we note the use of the verb, it again looks like Lukan redaction: but ἐτέλεσεν looks even more like Matthean redaction, so the IQP settles for ἐ[[πλήρω]]σεν. We note the confidence with which augment and termination are supplied, in contrast to the C-level [[πλήρω]].

This then leads into a rather simpler problem with (iv), the choice between Matthew’s τοὺς λόγους τούτους and Luke’s πάντα τὰ ῥήματα αὐτοῦ. Luke is fond of ῥῆμα (5/2/19 + 14: 3:2R; 20:26R), and of pleonastic πάντα, which is common (4:37R; 5:17R), so it would be wise to avoid Luke and accept the colorless Matthean form, if only on the C-level. But it is not so easy with (v), the audience. Both evangelists represent the Sermon as taking place before a crowd, so one might expect the IQP to include that in its critical text. Unfortunately Matthew’s οἱ ὄχλοι sound very like Matthew, and Luke’s ὁ λαός sounds very like Luke (12/2/36 + 48: 3:18R, 6:17R), and εἰς τὰς ἀκοὰς + gen. recurs in Acts 17:20: so the wise thing seems to be to forget the whole issue.

These unresolvable dilemmas arise only because of the basic contradiction in the IQP criteria. It would be possible simply to print the Matthean text as Q, and this is done by Polag;<sup>23</sup> one may then see the Lukan version as a series of Lukan redactions. But of course there is a price to this: Q looks even more like Matthew.

• • • • •

So many phrases, clauses, whole sentences, many of them of striking form, often linked by a common doctrinal tendency, seem to compel the conclusion that *Q’s thought*

<sup>23</sup> See Heinz Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium* (Freiburg/Basel/Vienna: Herder, 1969) 1.391: Matthew gave the Q-form in Matt 7:28, and thereafter reproduced it at the end of each of his discourses!

and language were very similar to Matthew's. We should ask, however, before accepting it, whether there may be some alternative explanation that would save the reputation of the IQP. Two suggestions are available:

1. Christopher Tuckett has argued, with reference to the word-count form of the argument, that many of the examples offered of Matthean language find only one or perhaps two parallels in Q, so that we are comparing frequent usages in Matthew with what may be unique usages by Q.<sup>24</sup> Furthermore we should expect a second author to pick out and use certain language from his source, whatever was congenial to him. Mark, for instance, uses ὑποκριτής once and τότε a few times; Matthew likes these words, and not only takes them over in their Markan context but uses them often (τότε 90 times!) himself. Should we not expect him to do the same with Q words that were by no means typical of Q?

The point stands, but is irrelevant. With eighteen thousand words in Matthew, we may hope to pick out characteristic phrasing, used five or six times; with eighteen hundred words in QC, any characteristic phrases are likely to come much less often. But what this analysis has shown is that over a broad front Matthew's preferred language occurs in Q also; so Matthew often takes up phrases peculiar to Q and himself, even if they cannot be shown to be characteristic of Q. But even then the broad use of hell imagery in Q shows that, like Matthew, he felt the duty to warn his flock of their eternal peril, in a way not widely used in the early church. Tuckett's examples are misleading too. τότε is one of the commonest words in the Greek language, and ὑποκριτής is a standard accusation of religious inadequacy. The examples I have offered above are of long phrases, clauses, and sentences, and of shorter expressions that are striking because they occur nowhere else (or very rarely) in the NT. The mind of the man who wrote γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, or πᾶν δένδρον μὴ ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλὸν ἐκκόπτεται καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλεται, or ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων, or the double animal images is very close to the mind of Matthew; and the same goes for shorter phrases like ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης, or the converse ruling on confessing and denying Christ.

2. Mark Goodacre has applied a brilliant counter-test to my claim that Matthean wording occurs frequently in Q:<sup>25</sup> he has made use of my list of Lukan words to show that some of them occur frequently in Q also. Hence, it might equally well be argued that Q was very close to Luke, or even that their authors were the same person.

It is to avoid the complexities of this argument that I have moved the discussion from individual words to the longer phrases I have cited above; though some of these, such as ἄνθρωπος with a noun, or ἀγαθός/πονηρός, are helpfully criticized by Goodacre. Naturally there are typically Lukan phrases in Q, as there are Lukan words, but they are brief and colorless compared with the Matthean phrases. Luke has ὑποδεικνύειν ὑμῖν in Luke 6:47; 12:5; Acts 20:35, and it comes also in Q in Matt 3:7/Luke 3:7; or he has τοὶ λέγω ὑμῖν in Luke 11:51; 12:5, and it comes in Q in Matt 11: 9/Luke 7:26.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>24</sup> Christopher Tuckett, "The Existence of Q," in *The Gospel behind the Gospels*, 19–47.

<sup>25</sup> Goodacre, *Goulder and the Gospels*, 42–88.

<sup>26</sup> The most serious difficulty that Goodacre poses is Ἱερουσαλήμ, Ἱερουσαλήμ in Matt

Goodacre makes the point that, whereas Matthew has a distinctive, stereotyped style in which phrases, clauses, and whole sentences may be repeated, Luke has a richer, more varied vocabulary, in which “characteristic” groups of words are less frequent and less striking.<sup>27</sup> However, I think it is possible to meet this point. In chap. 3 of my *Luke* I picked out a number of characteristic ways in which Luke writes. For example, he is fond of anarthrous fours: ἀναπαύου, φάγε, πίε, εὐφραίνου, or πτωχούς, ἀναπειρους, χωλούς, τυφλούς. Or he tends to have proportions of ten to one: ten lepers with one grateful, ten drachmas with one lost, ten servants with a mina apiece, fifty dinars and five hundred. Or he may artistically repeat his message in *oratio recta* in a parable: “he came seeking fruit on it and found none . . . I have been coming seeking fruit on this fig and find none”; “Which of you wanting to build a tower . . . and not being able to complete it . . . This man began to build and could not complete.” There are surely sufficient Lukan ways of putting things to enable a fair counter-test to be tried. If it were accident that so many Matthean locutions occurred in Q, we should expect a similar number of Lukan locutions to recur there by accident also (and one or two have). But unless a similar counter-test can be mounted, on the scale of the Matthean evidence in this article, I submit that the case stands: *Q is very close to Matthew, both in phrasing and in thinking*. Luke has merely taken on a limited number of brief and unremarkable phrases, which he found congenial.

I fear it is too late to save the IQP: a monumental amount of work has been done. It is in the press; nothing can stop the juggernaut now. But the study of Q is not finished. Future students may refuse the self-contradiction that undermines the grand structure, as surely as self-contradiction undermined the colossus of Marxism-Leninism. We may then expect advance in a different direction: new editions of Q will be published, based on the sounder criterion: *Q's phrasing and thinking are very close to Matthew's, so characteristic Matthean phrasing in QD is likely to go back to Q*. Such editions will naturally present a far more Matthean version of Q than the IQP. I suppose there will always be radicals brought up on William of Occam, who think we should not multiply hypotheses beyond what is necessary: if Q writes and thinks like Matthew, and lived in the same area in the same decade, perhaps we should dispense with the Q hypothesis altogether. But far be it from me to embarrass the IQP team by suggesting that they have been hunting a will-o'-the-wisp: what I am asking for is a serious reassessment of their criteria in the light of the evidence.

Michael Goulder  
University of Birmingham, Birmingham B15 2TT, UK

---

23:37/Luke 13:34QC (84): for (i) Matthew always elsewhere writes Ἱεροσόλυμα, while Luke prefers the Semitic form; and (ii) Luke alone elsewhere has the doubled reproachful opening vocatives, “Martha, Martha,” “Saul, Saul,” etc. But Matthew inserts the Semitic vocative γῆ Ἰουδα in 2:5, against his normal Ἰουδαία; and he is given to reproaching cities in the Semitic vocative—Chorazin, Bethsaida, Capernaum—and citing addresses to other Semitic places—Bethlehem, Zebulun, Nephthalim. Euphony might come into it too in 23:37; and he might feel that Jerusalem deserved a double reproach.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., 84–85.

THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY BIBLE  
AND  
BIBLIA HEBRAICA QUINTA

JAMES A. SANDERS

Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center, Claremont, CA 91711

The publication of two full volumes of *The Hebrew University Bible* (HUB), in 1995 and 1997, followed in 1998 by the publication of an initial, sample fascicle of *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* (BHQ), provides the opportunity to offer a perspective on the place each project may eventually have in the history of the text of the Hebrew Bible.<sup>1</sup>

When viewed in terms of the history of textual criticism since the sixteenth century, the concept underlying the Hebrew University Bible Project (HUBP) has been revolutionary from its inception in 1955. The Hebrew Old Testament Text Project (HOTTP), which had its inception in 1969, sponsored by the United Bible Societies (UBS), independently joined the HUBP in that revolution. The two projects had quite different needs out of which they separately grew, but they converged in concept as the independent work on each progressed.

The HUBP came into being because of the perceived necessity to locate the newly recovered Aleppo Codex in the history of the development of the text of the Hebrew Bible. The HOTTP came into being because of the perceived necessity to assist recently formed national translation committees around the world in dealing with difficult passages, which often had conflicting solutions among the translations in the former colonial or common Western languages resorted to by the local translation committees. Because the HOTTP committee was formed by Eugene Nida, the world-renowned linguist who headed the Translations Department of the UBS, its members were selected in large part because of their awareness of the changes being effected in the concept and practice of text criticism by the recovery of the Judean Desert Scrolls. Results from decades of study of the scrolls have affected both projects profoundly.

The chief result of study of the Judean Scrolls for text criticism has been a completely new appreciation of the history of transmission of the biblical text.<sup>2</sup> That history

<sup>1</sup> *Sefer Yishayahu* (ed. Moshe Goshen-Gottstein; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1995); *Sefer Yirmeyahu* (ed. S. Talmon, E. Tov, and C. Rabin; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1997); *Biblia Hebraica Quinta: Fasciculus extra seriem, Librum Ruth* (ed. Jan de Waard; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1998). The present study is based on a presentation, invited by the Hebrew University Bible Project, made at the Twelfth World Congress of Jewish Studies at Hebrew University in Jerusalem on 30 July 1997, and repeated by invitation at the thirtieth anniversary meeting of the Columbia University Hebrew Bible Seminar on 18 March 1998.

<sup>2</sup> See the introduction to Moshe Goshen-Gottstein, *The Hebrew University Bible Project: The Book of Isaiah, Sample Edition with Introduction* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1965) 11–20; essentially reprinted in *The Hebrew University Bible: The Book of Isaiah* (ed. M. Goshen-Gottstein; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1995) xi–xx; extensively edited in *The Hebrew University Bible: The Book of*

is the only ground upon which a valid and responsible hermeneutic of text criticism should be established.<sup>3</sup> While the terminology used by the two projects is slightly different, the history perceived is the same. The discovery of the scrolls and the recovery of Codex Aleppensis provided both the near beginnings of the history of textual transmission and the near climax of its development in the hands of the Ben Asher family at the end of the ninth century CE and the beginning of the tenth. It was now possible to look at that history with a kind of confidence never before experienced in the annals of text criticism.<sup>4</sup>

The HOTTP decided early on that a clear distinction should be made between the history of the literary formation of the text, and the subsequent history of the transmission of the text. While those two histories overlap somewhat, it became clear that text criticism had become a servant, if not slave, to the particular hermeneutic of exegesis out of which this or that scholar worked. A received reading would sometimes be condemned as corrupt in order for the scholar to construct a different text to fit what the scholar thought the text should have said; then would begin the search for a "variant reading" in the versions, or in Kennicott and de Rossi, to substantiate the new reading. And if such could not be found, then conjecture filled the bill. This view of text criticism still prevails in some circles as can still be seen in commentaries and translations published in the second half of this century. The New English Bible (1970), The New American Bible (1970), the Bible de Jerusalem (1st ed., 1970), the New Revised Standard Version (1989), and even somewhat the Tanakh (published by the JPS in 1988), provide examples of translations built in part on the older view of text criticism. The older Revised Standard Version remained basically true to the King James Version as a formal-equivalence translation. HUBP and HOTTP both reject conjecture as a valid text-critical choice unless a conjectural reading can be shown to have been the ancient cause of subsequent disparate readings; but such cases are relatively rare.

The history of transmission of the text begins with the earliest attested texts available, and that aspect of the history has been greatly advanced because of the discovery of the Judean Scrolls. That marks what the HUBP calls the first stage of the history that begins with the third-century BCE fragments from Qumran cave 4, and with the earliest available Greek translations. Its main characteristic is textual fluidity—limited fluidity, to be sure—but nonetheless quite distinct from the second stage. That fluidity, which M. Goshen-Gottstein saw continuing in a greatly reduced mode into the Masoretic period, he called a "main current" with "rivulets" running alongside (see the *HUB* Isaiah volume, p. xvii), but which S. Talmon calls "dominant family" and "variant traditions" (Jeremiah volume, p. xii).

The UBS committee calls the stage of a retrojected *Urtext* the First Period, and

---

*Jeremiah* (ed. C. Rabin, S. Talmon, and E. Tov; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1997) ix–xiii. See also Shemaryahu Talmon, "Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible in the Light of Qumran Manuscripts," *Textus* 4 (1964) 95–132; and idem, "The Old Testament Text," in *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, Vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970) 159–99, esp. 164–66; and Dominique Barthélemy, "Text, Hebrew, History of," *IDBSup*, 878–84.

<sup>3</sup> J. A. Sanders, "Hermeneutics of Text Criticism," *Textus* 18 (1995) 1–26.

<sup>4</sup> The work of E. Tov on the Qumran system or practice, especially in orthography, morphology, and scribal practices has been especially helpful; see E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992) esp. 100–117.

the stage of earliest attested texts the Second Period—with the clear understanding that the First Period is the province of exegesis, literary criticism, and historical reconstruction, but not that of text criticism.<sup>5</sup> The HUBP, perhaps wisely, sees the history of transmission starting only with the period of the earliest attested texts, their First Stage and our Second Period. We on the HOTTP decided to call the period of the literary development or history of formation of the text (when textual transmission was admittedly beginning to be a part of the picture) the First Period to be clear that the two should not be confused.

There is then a clear demarcation between biblical manuscripts that fit the First Stage and those that date from after the fall of Jerusalem—by and large the distinction between biblical texts from Qumran and those from the other provenances covered by the general term *Judean Desert Scrolls*. These latter (Murabbaʿat, Ḥever, Masada) fit a proto-MT pattern that we already knew in the quite literal Greek translations attributed to Aquila, Theodotion, and to some extent Symmachus, which date from early in the second century of the Common Era. The location of the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever in the late first century BCE, or early first century CE, provided the clear link necessary to see that the first century of the Common Era was one of intensive text-critical activity which resulted in a standard that would be called proto-Masoretic.<sup>6</sup>

The Judean Desert Scrolls have, in sum, provided the base for the new history of transmission of the biblical text. The link in the transition from pre-Masoretic to proto-Masoretic thus came to light and became an essential part of the history of the text as now perceived. The shift from pre- to proto-Masoretic is rather dramatic to observe, though “thin layers” of variant readings continue even into citations in rabbinic literature, and can be seen in the work of Jerome in the fourth and early fifth century CE. At the other end of the spectrum, it has become clear for many of us (*pace* Paolo Sacchi and the Turin school) that the variant readings in post-eleventh-century Masoretic manuscripts collated by Kennicott, de Rossi, and Ginsburg were derivative and, with few exceptions, did not date back before the Masoretic period.<sup>7</sup>

The HUBP plans to publish text-critical commentaries later to accompany the fascicles of the *HUB*,<sup>8</sup> whereas the HOTTP has published elaborate text-critical commentaries authored by Dominique Barthélemy in *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, of which three hefty volumes (of a total of six projected) have already appeared.<sup>9</sup> Each fascicle of *BHQ* will be accompanied by a much more succinct text-critical commentary.

Articles in *Textus* and elsewhere, written by members of the HUBP, stress the

<sup>5</sup> See the trenchant discussion of the blurred distinctions between “higher” and “lower” criticism in S. Talmon, “Textual Study of the Bible,” in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (ed. F. M. Cross and S. Talmon; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975) 327–32.

<sup>6</sup> D. Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila: Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécapropheton* (VTSup 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963); *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8HevXIIgr)* (ed. E. Tov; DJD 8; Oxford: Clarendon, 1990) ix–x, 1–2.

<sup>7</sup> M. Goshen-Gottstein, “Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts: Their History and Their Place in the HUBP Edition,” *Bib* 48 (1967) 243–90.

<sup>8</sup> See the sample offered by S. Talmon and E. Tov, “A Commentary on the Text of Jeremiah 1: The LXX of Jeremiah 1:1–7,” *Textus* 9 (1981) 1–15.

<sup>9</sup> D. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, Vols. 1–3 (Fribourg: Éditions universitaires, 1982, 1986, 1992) (= CTAT).



importance of bringing medieval rabbinic and Qaraite grammarians and commentators into text-critical discussions. Each problem dealt with by the HOTTP, as seen in *CTAT*, includes the medieval Jewish and Qaraite sources in its discussion of the textual history of each problem. And often we in the HOTTP found that the medieval grammarians' knowledge of Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic grammar and syntax, the philological tools and grammatical theories of which they learned from grammarians of the Arabic language rather than from Greek and Latin classical grammarians (as is the case with modern European Hebrew Grammars), offered the key to understanding the textual problem addressed. Apparatus V–VI in *HUB* provides a bare beginning of such a commentary for the books of Isaiah and Jeremiah, but there can be no substitute for a text-critical commentary to accompany each biblical book, as is planned also for *BHQ*.

The *HUB* offers two distinct innovations that are significant. I know of no prior effort in a text edition to cover Scripture citations in the basic rabbinic literature: Mishnah, Tosefta, the two Talmudim, and the great Midrashim. The importance of this will only gradually be seen by some students of the text. As the editors carefully state, this is a delicate area that requires knowledge of the rabbinic mind to evaluate, but it certainly belongs in a critical edition of the text that claims to provide in its apparatuses a succinct but complete history of the text. If pre-Masoretic readings survive into the proto-Masoretic period we need to know it, even if the "rivulets" or "thin layers" have considerably diminished in number. Citations in rabbinic literature demonstrate clearly the adaptability of the Masoretic Text even within rather clear-cut limits of manipulability.

Scripture in the NT, by contrast, is virtually ignored in the *HUB*. Some formulaic citations of scripture in the NT, especially in Matthew and Luke, may give evidence of the late-first-century situation of the stabilization of OG translations; but most scriptural intertextuality in the NT (Paul, Mark, John) gives clear evidence of the earlier pre-Masoretic period of textual fluidity similar to that in much of the Qumran literature.<sup>10</sup>

The other innovation of the *HUB* apparatus structure is its inclusion of readings from the Cairo Genizah.<sup>11</sup> With these two innovations the history of the text is presented more fully than in any other critical edition of the Bible so far attempted. One should note, too, that both the Isaiah and the Jeremiah volumes have included readings from the newly recovered Firkowitch manuscripts in Russia, being photographed and studied by Malachi Beit-Arié and others.<sup>12</sup> One does wonder, however, if the desire to present a full history of the text is to be realized if one can essentially overlook the second column of Origen's *Hexapla*. Despite giving "pride of place" to the early versions in the first apparatus, the *HUB* shows a tendency to privilege the Hebrew-language witnesses.

Most prior reviews of the Isaiah fascicles have highlighted the problem involved in

<sup>10</sup> See J. A. Sanders, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Biblical Studies," in *Sha'arei Talmon: Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon* (ed. M. Fishbane and E. Tov; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992) 326–29; idem, "Intertextuality and Canon," forthcoming in *On the Way to Nineveh: Studies in Honor of George M. Landes* (ed. S. L. Cook and S. C. Winter; American School of Oriental Research Publications).

<sup>11</sup> *BHQ* plans to include readings from the Cairo Genizah that date before 1000 CE. The *BHS* apparatus indiscriminately included some Genizah readings.

<sup>12</sup> See M. Beit-Arié, "The Accessibility of the Russian Manuscript Collections: New Perspectives for Jewish Studies," *The Folio: The Bulletin of the Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center for Preservation and Research* 13 (Winter 1995) 1–7.

grouping Judean Scrolls readings with rabbinic citations, but the editors are fully aware of the problem, and equally aware of the problems that would arise trying to set the historical shift from pre-Masoretic to proto-Masoretic at the beginning of the second century CE as the basic criterion, ignoring the distinction between text and versions, for constructing the apparatuses.<sup>13</sup>

What is truly remarkable about the change that has taken place in the concept and theory of text criticism, since the recovery of the Judean Desert Scrolls and of Aleppo-sis at the middle of this century, is the importance of the classical Tiberian Masorah to understanding the text of the Hebrew Bible.<sup>14</sup> It takes both *ketiv* and *qere* to make *Miqra*!<sup>15</sup>

A quick glance at the history of modern, or post-Renaissance, text criticism will help. When in 1519 Martin Luther translated the NT into German, he simply used Erasmus's text. But when in 1523 he started work on translating the Hebrew Bible, he ran into text-critical problems. He basically used the Brescia Bible of 1494, but often used the Vulgate to translate text-critically difficult texts.<sup>16</sup> He devised a hermeneutic of text criticism in order to choose among variant readings. That hermeneutic, which he called *Res et Argumentum*, was very clear; one chose the reading that pointed forward to the *Res* or Gospel of Jesus Christ. (Of course, by that he meant his understanding of Paul's understanding of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.) Following but largely misconstruing the work of Elias Levita, Luther devalued the work of the Masoretes, which meant that one could vocalize and parse the consonantal text without the Masoretic constraints of vowels, accents, and masorot. This gave license to several generations of scholars to emend the text almost at exegetic will, such as Capellus, Houbigant, Morin, Simon, and the whole *Critica Sacra* movement.

That situation led Baruch Spinoza in 1670 to publish his now famous tractate declaring that the truth of the Bible would be discovered in discerning the history of the formation of the biblical text and the authorial intentionality of its individual writers. In Spinoza one saw the full result of the Renaissance of Greek philosophy and culture that had begun in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries: it was the original individual's thought that was inspired and authoritative. The community dimension of biblical literature, in which anonymity of authorship was common, succumbed to hellenization in many ways, including the pseudepigraphic attribution of biblical books to well-known figures of the past. The Renaissance brought renewed interest in authorial intentionality. The anonymous community dimension of biblical literature was considerably com-

<sup>13</sup> E.g., P. A. H. de Boer in VT 16 (1966) 247–52; and B. J. Roberts in JTS (1967) 166–68. By contrast, see E. J. Revell in JBL (1977) 120–22.

<sup>14</sup> See now *The Leningrad Codex: A Facsimile Edition* (ed. D. N. Freedman, Astrid Beck, et al.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Leiden: Brill, 1998). The Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center, through West Semitic Research, provided each book editor of BHQ with the pertinent transparencies of L well in advance of publication of the facsimile edition.

<sup>15</sup> See J. A. Sanders, "The Task of Text Criticism," in *Problems in Biblical Theology: Essays in Honor of Rolf Knierim* (ed. H. Sun and K. Eades; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997) 315–27, esp. 316.

<sup>16</sup> Precisely the practice of the translation committees the UBS has sought to help in forming the Greek New Testament Project and the HOTTP, and also the reason for many of the tools of text-critical analysis in the quest for true variants as over against pseudo-variants.

promised. Spinoza in his genius went on to say that such a history would probably never be complete, and discerning authorial intentionality would more than likely not be possible. Spinoza was declared *persona non grata* by both synagogue and church, but his influence, whether he was cited or not, was considerable.<sup>17</sup>

By the time of Johann David Michaelis in the eighteenth century the hermeneutic had changed from the aim of pointing to the Gospel of Jesus Christ, to reconstructing as far as possible the *ipsissima verba* of biblical authors; but the denigration of the work of the Masoretes continued, since it clearly served the purpose of emending the text as exegesis of so-called original meanings indicated. In fact, that aspect of Luther's hermeneutic persists in scholarship today. Paul Kahle, whose work in text criticism has probably been the most influential of any scholar in this century, dismissed the work of the Masoretes as a creation of the Ben Asher family, in effect continuing to denigrate the oral traditions on which it drew.<sup>18</sup> *The Hebrew University Bible*, as well as *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* in due course, will finally rectify a situation that has obtained since the sixteenth century. Both projects have in effect rehabilitated the worth and value of the work of the Tiberian Masoretes for understanding the text of the Bible.<sup>19</sup> The corrective had begun with Gérard Weil's work on the Masorah for the *BHS* (= *BH<sup>4</sup>*).

The HUBP struggled through a number of problems having to do with the logistics of constructing a critical text of the Bible. There were two precipices to avoid: on the one hand, drowning the apparatus in innumerable alleged readings; on the other, overworking the tools of analysis in order to pare down the number of notations.<sup>20</sup> The solution they arrived at is probably as circumspect as a critical edition of the Bible can be: to abandon eclectic apparatuses that quote supporting witnesses if exegesis requires it, but instead to construct five apparatuses, four of which would contain notations of the several types of variant witnesses, and a fifth that would offer the editors' subjective judgment as to which is a true variant. The four apparatuses offer the following: in the first, the apparently variant readings in the ancient versions; in the second, those in witnesses to the Hebrew text; in the third, the medieval biblical manuscripts; and in the fourth, Masoretic variations in spelling, vowels, and accents. The editors feel they have presented in those four apparatuses the basic history of the text *ad loc.*, and with very few exceptions they are very thorough indeed.<sup>21</sup>

It is the fifth/sixth apparatus, first in modern Hebrew and then in English, that offers the subjective judgments of the editors about the results of using text-critical tools of analysis. This final apparatus hints at the eventual text-critical commentary proposed for each volume. In many ways the commentaries should provide the excitement that the fifth apparatus only teasingly suggests.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>17</sup> Sanders, "Hermeneutics of Text Criticism," esp. 2–4.

<sup>18</sup> Paul Kahle, *Der hebräische Bibeltext seit Franz Delitzsch* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1961) 51. See the trenchant remarks by M. Goshen-Gottstein in "The Rise of the Tiberian Bible Text," in *Biblical and Other Studies* (ed. Alexander Altmann; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963) 89.

<sup>19</sup> See the discussion by Barthélemy in *CTAT*, Vol. 3 (1992) ccxxviii–ccxxviii.

<sup>20</sup> As put by M. Goshen-Gottstein in *Text and Language in Bible and Qumran* (Jerusalem: Orient Publishing House, 1960) xiii.

<sup>21</sup> Granting some of the points made by P. A. H. de Boer in VT 16 (see n. 13 above), and the obvious observation that there is the subjectivity factor throughout the enterprise.

<sup>22</sup> See the preliminary effort in Talmon and Tov, "Commentary on the Text of Jeremiah 1."

HOTTP worked the other way round. Through Dominique Barthélemy's analytical reports in *CTAT*, we are providing in-depth text-critical commentaries on over five thousand textual problems of all sorts. Those commentaries offer extensive analyses of the history of the text, where each problem is addressed, from the earliest witnesses through the medieval grammarians and commentators to the vagaries of modern critical research on the text. And now the work of constructing a handbook critical edition is in the hands of the next generation, the team working on *BHQ*.

The *task* of text criticism is to locate true variants, of whatever literary length, over against pseudo-variants. The *aim* of text criticism is to establish the date in the earliest history of transmission of the text when inner literary developments are basically complete and when ancient Jewish believing communities accepted those texts as functionally canonical (Talmon's *Gruppentexte*), at which text-critical judgments are designed to point. The *goal* of text criticism is finally to provide the soundest possible base for establishing the critically most responsible text for reading and translation. And *HUB* and *BHQ* of necessity have as their major job to present the essential, critically considered history of the text for use by readers of any and all persuasions, no matter their aim.

A difficulty both projects have is one shared by all efforts to present a fully critical edition of the text, and that is caused by the constraints imposed by the goal sought, namely, a printed, critical edition. Both projects have to apologize at the outset that the printed page cannot reproduce precisely the manuscript used as base text. Instead of the three-column-width page or folio of the manuscript, it is necessary for both to present the text in a single column. The masorah magna has to be adjusted somewhat to make the printed page legible for scholars. And there are other adjustments demanded by the requirements of *mise-en-page*.

But considerably more important is the fact that because of the constraints of a printed critical edition, each text-critical problem is presented in words and short phrases, leaving to the reader the all-important work of seeing those words and phrases in their fuller literary context. Time and again we found on the HOTTP—and I assume this is the case for the teams producing both the *HUB* and *BHQ*—that it was not until we had placed the problem addressed in its fuller context that we could see what was really going on in the text and place the problematic word or phrase in that larger context. It is not until one can perceive the concept underlying the fuller text or version that one can understand why the variant text came to be. As Elias Bickerman pointed out, every translation was intended to serve the needs of the community for which it was translated.<sup>23</sup> This is sometimes the case even for copies of the Hebrew text itself, as with the large *Isaiah Scroll*, and most of the Qumran biblical texts. Every tradent, whether copyist or translator, had a concept of what the text he or she was handing on meant; and his or her concept of the text of necessity was lodged in the cultural thought forms of the tradent and the community served.

Commonly the concept we scholars attribute to a biblical text in its so-called original setting is not the one operative in the traditions derived from it. The later tradent may have had a cogent and consistent view of what the text meant in his or her contemporary cultural terms, and then slightly adapted the copy or translation at certain junctures in the text to fit that view. Fortunately, there are now available new subdisciplines

<sup>23</sup> Elias Bickerman, *Studies in Jewish and Christian History* (Leiden: Brill, 1976) 1.196.

of biblical study that can help us understand the underlying concept behind a text or translation, as well as better comprehend our own understanding of the text—specifically, structure and concept analysis.<sup>24</sup> The fuller text-critical commentaries in *CTAT* well reflect use of such analysis, but it is impossible to present all the essential arguments of such crucial studies in a printed critical edition of a text; only the bare results can be suggested, as they sometimes are in the fifth/sixth apparatus of the *HUB*. Text-critical commentaries must reflect this aspect of the work of text criticism far more than they have to date in order to move the art of text criticism away from the tendency to think in terms of isolated words and short phrases.

This is perhaps not the place to reiterate the case for the pluriform Bible, in which the larger contexts of variant understandings of the same text can be presented in full; but I feel compelled to mention it.<sup>25</sup> This has begun to happen in Bibles that offer translations of the Hebrew Esther in the canonical Bible but also translations of the Greek Esther, which presents quite a different concept of the story, in the so-called apocryphal section. And, of course, it also happens willy-nilly within the Hebrew Bible where there are doublets, such as the Ten Commandments, Psalm 18/2 Samuel 22, and many other doublets, even triplets.<sup>26</sup> Full structure analysis of larger variant passages within biblical books will eventually, I think, show the necessity of presenting in parallel columns the MT and the LXX understandings of the same story or pericope, simply because focus on the isolated words and short phrases does not present or even indicate the full history of the text.

Both the HUBP and the HOTTP fully realize that we have never before had an *editio critica maior* of the Hebrew Bible. *The Hebrew University Bible* may be as close to such as we will ever attain, and the fact that it is permits *BHQ* essentially to remain a *Handausgabe* for more general use. The *HUB* places us pretty far down the road toward an *editio critica maior*, presenting a history of the text, book by book; and *CTAT* places us pretty far down the road toward what a text-critical commentary should be, evaluating the whole history of selected textual problems, book by book, from the earliest witnesses to the latest scholarly treatises.

The concept underlying both projects is based on the same understanding of the history of transmission of the text. They both agree that while exegesis will always be a limited part of the text-critical enterprise, it cannot any longer be permitted to dominate it. And they both agree that the aim of text criticism can be neither to point to some future goal of history, nor to the primitive historical, even mythic origins of a text's authorial intentionality, nor indeed to the earliest stages of a text's transmission while it was still in literary development,<sup>27</sup> but to that point in its history when the text first

<sup>24</sup> See J. A. Sanders, "The Task of Text Criticism," in *Problems in Biblical Theology*, 315–27, esp. 326–27.

<sup>25</sup> See, e.g., J. A. Sanders, "Stability and Fluidity in Text and Canon," in *Tradition of the Text: Studies offered to Dominique Barthélemy in Celebration of his 70th Birthday* (ed. G. Norton and S. Pisano; OBO 109; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1991) 203–17.

<sup>26</sup> It is interesting to note that the masorah parva often protects the variant readings between the doublets, indicating the Masoretic insistence that the biblical text not be harmonized.

<sup>27</sup> Pace E. Tov in *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992) 313–49.

became the community literature of a believing community.<sup>28</sup> And that point antedates both Christianity and rabbinic Judaism.

If this is the case, then confessional differences among us should not be a stumbling block to producing a true *editio critica maior* together. *BHQ*, for the first time in the history of *Biblia Hebraica*, has Jews on the team preparing individual books.<sup>29</sup> The postmodern period provides the context in which to have true dialogue, not in this case about our differing confessional identities but about the texts on which those identities are based. Because of the acerbic nature of the charges and countercharges in the early centuries of Jewish-Christian debates about what the text was and what it meant, Origen provided a six-column comparison of the texts known to him in his time. He apparently wanted the debate to become a dialogue.

All current biblical critics, whether Jewish, Christian, or secular, are to a large extent children of the Renaissance in Europe of Greco-Roman culture, or we would not engage in it.<sup>30</sup> And now we are moving into a postmodern period in which we are forced to acknowledge that the observer is a part of the observed, and objectivity is but subjectivity under constraint. What better constraint can there be than dialogue in which our own most precious premises are carefully and thoughtfully critiqued by those who stand elsewhere? As the late Ferdinand Deist aptly put it, critique should not have the purpose of destroying the other's position, but to correct and strengthen it for the sake of true dialogue at a yet higher level.<sup>31</sup>

Just as both projects agree that textual analysis should lead to the location of true variants—that is, to a point where the arguments on both sides of a potential textual variant are equally strong, so that neither can be eliminated, thereby indicating the existence of a true variant<sup>32</sup>—so we should now move beyond competition to see who is right, to cooperation to see what is now right, in the postmodern period of human humility, for the sake of all the communities we serve, whether confessional or professional. The day when the idea that discrete critical schools or individual scholars alone could arrive at the truth of a text, and all others would eventually see the light, is gone. The invitation to me to offer a perspective on forty-two years of worthy labor on the part of the HUBP is perhaps the signal needed. Both *HUB* and *BHQ* mark a truly new phase in the history of the text of the Hebrew Bible.

<sup>28</sup> See Talmon's remarks in "The Textual Study of the Bible—A New Outlook," in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*, 325, in which he rejects the "three local texts" hypothesis in favor of understanding some texts as accepted by "a sociologically definable integrated body"—in our terms, a believing community—hence rendering that accepted text functionally canonical for that community.

<sup>29</sup> David Marcus (Ezra-Nehemiah), Leonard Greenspoon (Joshua), Abraham Tal (Genesis), and Zipporah Talshir (1–2 Chronicles).

<sup>30</sup> The encyclical *Divino afflante spiritu* of 1943 opened the door for Catholic scholars to engage in biblical criticism; see my tribute to Fr. Raymond Edward Brown (1928–1998) in *USQR* 52:3–4 (1999) 19–21.

<sup>31</sup> Ferdinand Deist, *Witnesses to the Old Testament* (Pretoria: NG Kerkboekhandel, 1988) 160–63. (Deist died in Heidelberg on 12 July 1997, on leave from Stellenbosch.)

<sup>32</sup> Well expressed by Goshen-Gottstein in *Text and Language*, 201.

Copyright of Journal of Biblical Literature is the property of Society of Biblical Literature and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.