How Our Life Rewrites Our God

A Study in Rewritten Bible as a Hermeneutical Tool in the Framework of Stanley Hauerwas's Narrative Ethics

Elisa Kössi, 40225

Pro gradu-avhandling i dogmatik

Handledare: Anni Maria Laato

Fakulteten för humaniora, psykologi och teologi

Åbo Akademi

2022

ÅBO AKADEMI UNIVERSITY – FACULTY OF ARTS, PSYCHOLOGY AND THEOLOGY

Abstract for master's thesis

Subject: Dogmatics	
Author: Elisa Kössi	
Thesis title: How Our Life Rewrites Our God: A Study in Rewritten Bible as a Hermeneutical Tool in the Framework of Stanley Hauerwas's Narrative Ethics	
Supervisor: Anni Maria Laato	
Abstract:	
Key words: biblical hermeneutics, biblical stories, narrative ethics, narrative theology, Rewritten Bible, Stanley Hauerwas	
Date: 13.5.2022	Page count: 102
The abstract passed as maturity examination:	

In the 1970-80s, Stanley Hauerwas became known for his narrative ethics which advocated Christian pacifism. In 1960s, Geza Vermes coined the concept of Rewritten Bible to understand early Jewish literature on Scripture. However, no one has yet investigated what could be won if the concepts were combined. This thesis brings these two perspectives together to explore ways of telling the Bible in the lives of religious communities.

My comparison of Hauerwas's narrative ethics and the different approaches to Rewritten Bible is completed using close reading of my source material and a thematic analysis of the key points found. In both Hauerwas and the Rewritten Bible discourse, authority of the stories considered as holy Scripture by the religious communities is central and the main motivation of telling them. The authoritative role of these stories then obligates their readers to make sense of what they read in their specific historical and cultural context, their lives. Rewritten Bible, in that sense, can be understood as the process of rereading translated to a lived reality, which can take the specific form of a literary work but not exclusively. To investigate these rereadings further could clarify how the concept of God itself shifts focus when given witness to through the lives of new generations of believers. I also argue that a suitable approach for this purpose in a Hauerwasian framework can be found in the methodological scepticism of Koskenniemi & Lindqvist suggested in the Rewritten Bible related publication *Rewritten Bible Reconsidered: Proceedings of the Conference in Karkku, Finland August 24-26 2006*. With an open-ended approach to rewritten stories like theirs it is possible to explore them and make them fruitful for systematic theology in its search for appropriate ways of talking about God.

Ultimately, the purpose of this thesis is to point a direction where the structures of variation in the concept of God that can be seen in the lives of religious communities can be explored. The results of this exploration could further be used in systematic theology to negotiate what God is and how he should be spoken of.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations 3
1 Introduction 4
1.1 The Task 4
1.2 Theory, Structure, and Method 4
1.3 Sources and Previous Study 5
1.3.1 The Peaceable Kingdom 6
1.3.2 Rewritten Bible 6
1.3.3 Animal Apocalypse 8
1.4 Some Notions on my Use of "Rewritten Bible" 8
2 Hauerwas and Rewritten Bible 10
2.1 Theoretical Framework: Stanley Hauerwas's Narrative Ethics 10
2.1.1 Scripture and Community in Hauerwas 11
2.1.2 Remembering, Rereading, Authority 14
2.2 Rewritten Bible: An Overview 17
2.2.1 Shift of Paradigm 20
2.2.2 Comment 22
2.3 The Search for a Heuristic Value 24
2.3.1 Authority 25
2.3.2 Rereading 33
2.4 Discussion 44
3 A Test Case: Animal Apocalypse 47
3.1 The Text in Its Context 47
3.1.1 Placing in the Enochic Body 48
3.1.2 The Ethiopic Book of Enoch 48
3.1.3 Historical context and dating of *An. Apoc.* 51
3.2 Rewritten Bible Methodology 54
3.2.1 What Counts as Rewritten Bible? 54
3.2.2 How to Read Rewritten Bible? 58
3.3 Animal Apocalypse as Rewritten Bible 61
3.3.1 The Text 62
3.3.2 Step 1: How Is the Text Changed? 68
3.3.3 Step 2: Why Is the Text Changed? 78
3.4 Discussion 83

4 Conclusion 87
4.1 Hauerwas and Rewritten Bible 87
4.2 An Inquiring Approach to God-talk 88
4.3 Some Thoughts for Future Elaboration 89
Swedish summary 91
Bibliography 97

Abbreviations

BBB	Bonner Biblische Beiträge
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft (und die Kunde der älteren Kirche)
EJ	Encyclopaedia Judaica
HTS	HTS Theological Studies
JSP	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha
SBLEJL	Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature
SRB	Studies in Rewritten Bible (Studies in Reception History of the Bible)
SVTP	Studia in Veteris Testamentis Pseudepigrapha
TRE	Theologische Realenzyklopädie

1 Introduction

1.1 The Task

This study explores the so-called "Rewritten Bible" as a hermeneutical model. Inspired by this concept originating in Jewish studies, I study the practice of rewriting biblical texts and stories as a hermeneutical tool against the premises of Stanley Hauerwas's narrative concept of ethics. Through this combination of originally unrelated concepts, I further aim to point towards possibilities of new forms of theologically sustainable God-talk relevant to systematic theology as a discipline. Combining the insights of the two concepts makes possible an approach to God in which exploring the structures of retelling God's story through the life of a religious community can be made fruitful for how the concept of God is understood and spoken of when doing theology.

1.2 Theory, Structure, and Method

This thesis brings together two concepts from completely different scholarly discourses to examine the structure and functions of biblical narrations outside the Bible. As the theoretical framework of this study, I have chosen Stanley Hauerwas's narrative theology in his *The Peaceable Kingdom. A Primer in Christian Ethics* (1983), which is presented in detail in chapter 2.1. From this perspective, in chapter 2.2, I look at the highly debated issue of the "Rewritten Bible," which emerged in the studies of early Judaism in the 1960s. Finally, in chapter 3, I present a test case where I probe the implications of this fusion. Below, I will be presenting the structure of this thesis chapter by chapter. I have also chosen to integrate the description of methods used in the below description of the thesis structure since they differ significantly between the different parts (chapter 2 and chapter 3) of the thesis. Further, the methodology of chapter 3 is more exhaustively presented in 3.2 because it heavily depends on the discussions of 2.2 and 2.3. Placing the description of that methodology after the theoretical substance and in the immediate context of the case to which it is applied helps render it logically intelligible.

In chapter 2.1, I present Hauerwas's narrative ethics as the theoretical framework of this thesis. For this, a close reading and conceptual analysis of the central themes in his understanding of the character of the Bible and its authoritative relation to a community of readers are used. In chapters 2.2 and 2.3, an overview and analysis of the more recent debate on the "Rewritten Bible" theme follow. Here I shall concentrate on the conceptual and methodological aspects. Again, the point of departure for my analysis is a close reading and comparison of my source material to identify central thematic emphases in the different scholars' thoughts. By introducing my sources in a discussion on central themes and problems around the concept of "Rewritten Bible," I intend to analyse some significant strands within the scholarship, which are helpful in understanding Biblical narrations from a Hauerwasian point of view. Due to this underlying agenda, I continually relate my remarks with central aspects of Hauerwas's concept so that the argued compatibility of the two concepts would become explicit.

After clarifying the connection the connection that I see between the two concepts, I exemplify in chapter 3 how the insights won from the Rewritten Bible debate can be applied to a concrete narrative. More precisely, I choose to analyze the Biblical narrative about Noah and the flood as narrated in an apocalyptic passage known as Animal Apocalypse (*An. Apoc.*) in the early Jewish collection of writings called 1 Enoch. The methodology that I use stems from Erkki Koskenniemi and Pekka Lindqvist and is developed as their proposal for analyzing Rewritten Bible in its different manifestations. Because the elaborations in chapter 2 are fundamental for understanding this methodology and its application, the whole methodology is described more precisely in the immediate context of my analysis of *An. Apoc.*, in chapter 3.2, preceded by the contextualization of the source text in chapter 3.1. My analysis follows in chapter 3.3, and chapter 3.4 shows what relevance the applied Rewritten Bible methodology could have for systematic theology from a Hauerwasian perspective. Finally, in my conclusion in chapter 4, I present the results of this thesis and suggest some topics for future research.

1.3 Sources and Previous Study

To my knowledge, there is no previous study that would combine the perspectives of Hauerwas's narrative ethics and Rewritten Bible. The list of previous contributions to *An. Apoc.*

that I rely on in my analysis is provided in the bibliography and discussed more thoroughly in chapter 3.3 and the notes to this chapter. In the following, I present my primary source material.

1.3.1 The Peaceable Kingdom

Written in 1983, *The Peaceable kingdom: A Primer in Christian Ethics* is the work of Stanley Hauerwas that most explicitly systematizes his concept of ethics. Hauerwas himself intimates in his introduction to the book that he has written it as his answer to the many requests for a more comprehensive account of his concept.[1] In this book, Hauerwas explicates some of the fundamental premises that can be found on the foundation of his former Christian pacifistic writings.[2] These premises include most importantly narrative as the basic epistemology of personhood, agency, and knowledge of God, the self, and the world—the truth itself. The emphasis on the narrative is then a direct dependent of the concrete human communities whose existence in the world is ultimately accidental. Ethics, from this point of view, are expressed in the ways of life of the communities and should be reflecting the fundamental narratives of the latter. The most characteristic manifesto of the ethics of a community are the virtues that are cultivated to help people live morally sustainable lives that accord to the narrative with which they identify. Because of this, Hauerwas argues that every ethic needs a qualifier that indicates, from which community's narrative its legitimacy should be sought, and that Christian ethics ultimately can logically only end up being pacifistic, an ethic of the peaceable kingdom.

1.3.2 Rewritten Bible

As far as the concept Rewritten Bible is concerned, I draw on multiple sources to bring theoretical perspectives into the discussion with each other. The first main source for my discussions on the theme is the anthology *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or*

[1] Hauerwas 1983, xvi.
[2] Such as *Vision and Virtue: Essays in Christian Ethical Reflection* (1974), *Character and the Christian Life: A Study in Theological Ethics* (1975), *Truthfulness and Tragedy: Further Investigations in Christian Ethics* (1977), *A Community of Character: Toward a Constructive Christian Social Ethic* (1981).

Techniques? A Last Dialogue with Geza Vermes (2014), edited by Józsezf Zsengellér as a collection of results of a Rewritten Bible conference in 2011. This collection of different perspectives on Rewritten Bible research provides a useful overview of recent discussions and the scholarly atmosphere around the concept. In its three parts, it not only includes in Part I the last comment of the father of the concept, Geza Vermes, on the discussion before his passing away in 2013 but also offers a broad insight into conceptual issues regarding the term "Rewritten Bible" itself in Part II, and lastly, ends with more detailed case studies in the field in Part III. Due to the task at hand, I will focus mainly on Part II; the contributions of Anders Klostergaard Petersen, Jonathan G. Campbell, Eugene Ulrich, George J. Brooke, Stefan Schorch, and Sidnie White Crawford constitute the basis of the discussions below. The invaluable testimony of Vermes that alone constitutes Part I of the anthology is naturally considered, especially when discussing the beginnings of the Rewritten Bible concept.

A few words about the different character of the respective contributions are beneficial here since not all of them, though concentrating on methodological issues, reflect in their use of the term Rewritten Bible. In the discussions below, this aspect might not be exhaustively evident from the outset. Notably, only Petersen and Campbell discuss the heuristic value of the concept systematically as the main task of their articles. In contrast, the others in differing degrees take their point of departure elsewhere, wishing to introduce aspects neglected in previous research or helpful when trying to clarify the concept. However, many of them do include a short overview of the central question in the Rewritten Bible debate as they understand it, although their respective foci are different.

In addition to the methodological considerations in the anthology of Zsengellér, I have introduced them in discussion with perspectives absent in the abovementioned contributions. For this purpose, I draw on two more main sources: Molly M. Zahn's monography *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts* (2011) and discourses in the SRB-network[3]. Due to the focus of this thesis on conceptual aspects, it is corresponding reflections that are of interest also in these contexts. Thus, the relevant material of Zahn's work is found in her introductory and conclusive chapters. Of SRB-publications I have included the methodological contributions of Erkki Koskenniemi and Pekka

[3] The capitals SRB originally stood for 'Studies in Rewritten Bible', but have been recently changed to 'Studies in the Reception History of the Bible'. SRB-network is an Åbo Akademi University-based network of study of early Jewish and Christian literature (Valve 2014, 20).

Lindqvist in their article “Rewritten Bible, Rewritten Stories: Methodological Aspects” in *Rewritten Bible Reconsidered: Proceedings of the Conference in Karkku, Finland August 24-26 2006* (2008), edited by Antti Laato and Jacques van Ruiten, and of Antti Laato in his “Gen 49:8-12 and Its Interpretation in Antiquity: A Methodological Approach to Understanding of the Rewritten Bible” in *Rewritten Biblical Figures* (2010) edited by Erkki Koskenniemi and Pekka Lindqvist.

In addition to the literature listed above, I have also consulted Lotta Valve’s reflection on the issue in the introductory chapter of her doctoral thesis, *Early Modes of Exegesis: Ideal Figures in Malachi as a Test Case* (2014) for perspective. Playing a minor role in her thesis itself, her compact overview of the Rewritten Bible discussion followed by an equally compact meta-level analysis of the phenomenon appears helpful to structure some aspects of my analysis.

1.3.3 Animal Apocalypse

I use one original source in my case study, namely Animal Apocalypse. The document is presented more exhaustively in chapter 3, which focuses mainly on that text. Here it should suffice to note that the text in question is a passage in apocalyptic Jewish writing from the 4th century, and its acceptance as an example of Rewritten Bible text has been the subject of scholarly controversy. The passage contains an account of the Jewish history from the Creation to the Hasmonean era,[4] including thus the primary turns of the biblical narrative but substituting all characters with symbolic animal figures.

1.4 Some Notions on my Use of “Rewritten Bible”

In this context, a notion should be made on my use of the term “Rewritten Bible.” As will be clear in the discussion below, a broad diversity in the form and phrasing of the term is found in the research. Since much of this diversity is in no way incidental but instead communicates the

[4] See 3.1.3 below.

author's stance on the concept, I, too, have decided to hold on to this multiplicity. When referring to the term in its most general sense as the subject of the whole debate, I use the form Rewritten Bible. This form I occasionally widen to Rewritten Bible/Scripture, especially towards the end of the discussion, where I deem it necessary to help keep in mind the different implied conceptions. However, when describing a certain scholar's view on the concept, I have chosen to follow their phrasing to keep the distinction from the former case clear. Of course, even with this precaution, it has not been possible to avoid the risk of confusion entirely. The forms 'Rewritten Bible' and 'Rewritten Bible/Scripture' are used by other scholars in their writings. I hope, however, to have been able to create some helpful order in the matter.

2 Hauerwas and Rewritten Bible

In this chapter, I first present my theoretical framework stemming from the US-theologian Stanley Hauerwas and his narrative ethics in chapter 2.1. This presentation is then followed by an elementary overview over the genesis, development, and general tendencies of the recent Rewritten Bible debate in chapter 2.2. After these preliminary ideas, chapter 2.3 introduces the reader to some of the most dominant underlying tendencies among the Rewritten Bible debaters that are further related to the theoretical framework of this thesis. Finally, in chapter 2.4, I bring together the different voices in the literature by elaborating further some of the aspects raised in the discussion.

2.1 Theoretical Framework: Stanley Hauerwas's Narrative Ethics

The systematic framework in which I aim at setting the reflections of this thesis is Stanley Hauerwas's narrative ethics. Due to the limited scope of the thesis, I have chosen to only refer to Hauerwas's discussion on the theme in *The Peaceable Kingdom*, where his standpoint regarding the character of Scripture on the one hand and the relationship between Scripture and the community that interprets it on the other hand are presented. A central notion both for understanding Hauerwas concept and for the purpose of this thesis is the dynamics of authority that plays a key integrative role in his system. The main point Hauerwas makes in his book is that when taking the Bible as the one main reference for carrying out a Christian life, it is not primarily some ethical to-do list of universal truths behind the text that is the goal for a Christian.[5] Rather, Hauerwas argues that it is the narration itself throughout the books and especially condensed in the person of Christ that is to be narrated forth in the life of the religious community, in his case the church.[6]

[5] Hauerwas 1983, 25-26, 32-33, 66-70, 75-76.
[6] Hauerwas 1983, 28-30, 33-34, 44-46, 60-62, 67-70, 73-74, 83-85.

2.1.1 Scripture and Community in Hauerwas

To begin with Scripture in Hauerwas, he lays a special weight on the formal aspects of the canon. The fact that Christians' sacred Scripture is a collected canon of different and, in many places, contradicting compositions is, for Hauerwas, neither coincidence nor catastrophe. Instead, it is this very form of the Bible best described as a conversation of many voices that, by virtue of God's choice, both accords it in the analogy of the (Christian) truth and bestows upon it its authority. For the conversational character and tension lie in the very nature of the canon and constitute the proper form of the story that God has chosen to be his own.[7] Scripture, then, has authority in its community "not because no one knows the truth, but because the truth is a conversation for which Scripture sets the agenda and boundaries."[8]

Following Hauerwas, however, it would be a fatal misjudgment to assume that the Bible in itself is sufficient to contain the story of God, because "the Bible without the community, without expounders, and interpreters, and hearers is a dead book."[9] The above-described connection between Scripture and the truth does not mean that the biblical books and the convictions to which they give expression do not need any interpretation. On the contrary, interpretation becomes a normative fact, and the reason for this is much more intimate to Scripture itself than an increased awareness of its cultural limits. According to Hauerwas, Christians do not feel the need to interpret the Bible first and foremost because they know its emergence is culturally conditioned. Instead, they are in a sense destined to do so because "Scripture itself initiates us into this activity" according to its very nature.[10] The diversity of the biblical books does not "pretend to be self-interpreting," and yet, "so much of it is interpretation on itself."[11] There is the New Testament that is "in many ways a midrash[12] on the Hebrew Scriptures."[13] And then there are in this New Testament "four gospels, each with its own emphasis," whose mutual interrelation is far from clear.[14]

---

[7] Hauerwas 1983, 97-98.
[8] Hauerwas 1983, 98.
[9] Hauerwas 1983, 98.
[10] Hauerwas 1983, 69-70.
[11] Hauerwas 1983, 70.
[12] Midrash ('seeking') means early Jewish, and especially rabbinic, interpretation of Biblical texts. A specific exegesis of a Biblical text or works collecting midrash interpretation can also be characterized as midrash. (Lindqvist 2011, 184).
[13] Hauerwas 1983, 70.
[14] Hauerwas 1983, 70.

But there is more to the community of expounders, interpreters, and hearers than a mere cognitive interpretation. In order not to end up a dead book, the Bible must be mediated through living people's concrete ways of life as Hauerwas himself describes:

> The fact that Christian ethics begins and ends with a story requires a corresponding community existing across time. The story of God as told through the experience of Israel and the church cannot be abstracted from those communities engaged in the telling and the hearing. As a story it cannot exist without a historic people, for it requires telling and remembering if it is to exist at all. God has entrusted his presence to a historic and contingent[15] community which can never rest on its past success, but must be renewed generation after generation. That is why the story is not merely told but embodied in a people's habits that form and are formed in worship, governance, and morality.[16]

This passage figures several key aspects to the relationship between Scripture and its interpreting community in Hauerwas's thought. Firstly, this community, too, is analogous in form to the truth. It can be said with Hauerwas that to have a sacred Scripture is to identify with the stories, or narratives, contained in that Scripture. The authority of Scripture only wins relevance in the formal setting of a community willing and "capable of allowing these differing texts to be read amongst us [them] with authority,"[17] that is, a community that endures the tensions and inconsistencies inside the canon because it acknowledges this diversity to be constitutive to its own identity—indeed, revealing the very nature of truth itself.[18] In turn, the conversational nature of the truth requires that the community also be a conversation if it wishes to remain true to its own identity. That is a part of being faithful, as Hauerwas puts it. A good community that wants to be faithful to the truth of Scripture cannot thus praise conformity but must accept differences and the potential of conflict they inevitably bring along as inherent in the very story of God.[19]

---

[15] Hauerwas defines his concept of contingency when arguing for narrative epistemology as the most analogous to worldly existence: "[N]arrative formally displays our existence and that of the world as creatures—as *contingent* beings. Narrative is required precisely because the world and events in the world do not exist by necessity. Any attempt to depict our world and ourselves non-narratively is doomed to failure insofar as it denies our contingent nature." (Hauerwas 1983, 28; emphasis in the original.) Contingency is thus a designation of a non-necessary existence.

[16] Hauerwas 1983, 97-98.

[17] Hauerwas 1983, 70.

[18] Hauerwas 1983, 98.

[19] Hauerwas 1983, 165, note 2.

Secondly, the truth manifested in the story of God is by its nature contingently mediated and Scripture as that story thus requires a historic community to remember, tell, and pass it on. This is important because it implies that the historicity and contingency are prerequisites both of knowing God and of witnessing to his presence before the (contingent) world. To be a community that bears God's story is to be a community of virtue whose way of being and acting in the contingent world reflects their knowledge of God as the truth of that story.[20] This truth, however, is not absolute, but becomes manifest in a constant state of renewal where the virtuous habitus of the community is formed in contact with its contingent forms of existence.[21] Ethics aside, the necessity of a historic community is according to Hauerwas the very meaning of confessing one's faith in "the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church" as a part of the creed.[22] This faith is not, however, a faith in the contingent community as such but in the fact of its existence because of God's choice to be present to the world this way: as a story embodied by a contingent and often not so faithful community. It is a faith in the church "in the sense that we know that it is not finally our creation, but exists only by God's calling of people."[23]

Thirdly, it is through the functions of telling and remembering that the interpreting community relates to Scripture.[24] While telling is identified with embodying and thus the concrete ways and choices of life of the community, [25] remembering relates more directly to Scripture as a critical authority in the community's self-understanding. According to Hauerwas, Scripture is essentially "the means the church uses to constantly test its memory."[26] Even so, the Bible is yet but one of the two main correctives in the community's formation process according to the story of God. Whereas the Bible is the fundamental frame of reference that sets boundaries for and thus in a sense exercises a *negative* control the lived story, *positive* examples of how the embodied story of God might look in a particular time and place are needed, too. For this, a

[20] Hauerwas 1983, 25-29, 32-34, 46, 67-68, 70-71, 93-95, 96-98, 103-106, 120.
[21] Hauerwas 1983, 45-46, 70, 97-98, 119-121, 131-134. The key to this understanding is the notion of "a people's habits", a reminder of Hauerwas's inclination towards Aristotelian virtue ethics. When depicting the narrative character of God's truth and knowledge simply as the story of God, it is through his emphasis on the virtuous habits of a community that Hauerwas avoids absolutizing his own concept. No cognition or episteme in the beginning, nor result or empirical fact in the end counts as criteria for the faithfulness of God's community. Instead, it is the changeable character of a contingent community that bears God's story, both in its faithfulness as its witness to "our God […] who wills nothing else than our good" and in its unfaithfulness, which it is to remember for the benefit of its own formation (ibid. 98).
[22] Hauerwas 1983, 98.
[23] Hauerwas 1983, 98.
[24] Hauerwas 1983, 97-100, 103.
[25] Hauerwas 1983, 25-26, 44-45, 93-94, 97-100, 107-108, 120-121.
[26] Hauerwas 1983, 98.

useful corrective is available in the lives and stories of "the saints," that is, people in whose lives the story of God can be seen particularly clearly manifested.[27]

Lastly, the historic and contingent nature of the existence of the truth in God's story has implications for how its two main manifestations, Scripture and the lives of saints, should be conceived in the process of remembering, telling, and embodying the sacred narrative. In other words, neither of these criteria can be generalized to some universal absolutes in order to impose them on lives outside the community but are inherent in its self-understanding.[28] Equally, both would be of no use for telling a living story of God without an intergenerational community with its lived life and memory that is the contingent medium of existence for that story and its truth.[29]

2.1.2 Remembering, Rereading, Authority

As we saw, Hauerwas particularly emphasizes both the *mutual dependence* of Scripture and a contingent community *through authority and identification*, and the *analogous form* of truth, Scripture, and community by God's choice. We also recognized the concept of *memory and remembering* as a central function of the community in living out this analogy intergenerationally so that the story of God exists at all through the ages. Now we turn to the latter to understand the role of remembering even deeper and to identify elements in Hauerwas thought that will prove relevant for the argument of this thesis.

In *The Peaceable Kingdom*, we find this enigmatic description of how memory relates to Christians being "a people of a book:"

> We Christians must recognize, by the very fact that we are a people of a book, that we are a community which lives through memory. We do not seek a philosophical truth separate from the book's text. Rather, we are a people of a book because we believe that "the love that moves the sun and the stars" is known in the people of Israel and the life of a particular

[27] Hauerwas 1983, 71, 76, 95, 97, 121, 133-134.
[28] Hauerwas 1983, 28, 32, 34, 50, 53, 60-63, 70, 97-98, 118-119.
[29] Hauerwas 1983, 70, 98.

> man, Jesus. Such "truth" is inherently contingent; it can only be passed on from one generation to another by memory. We test our memory with Scripture as we are rightly forced time after time to seek out new implications of that memory by the very process of passing it on.[30]

By maintaining the fact of Christians as "a people of a book," Hauerwas expresses a strong identification of a community with its sacred Scripture. Because this identification with the Scripture binds the identity of the community to the authority of the Scripture, this authority is to be intergenerationally transmitted. The only way this can be done is by remembering those stories so constitutive to the identity in order to then embody them in the life and choices of the community. However, the essentially contingent character of the process of passing on the narrative means that the act of remembering both changes that narrative and requires it to be changed so that the story of God whose good will is to be borne witness to would continue to exist in ever new social and historical conditions.[31] It is not only the authority of the book itself, but with it the identity of a people of the book and the truth about their good God that is at stake, when the world around changes, and the people in it. The memory should thus be transmitted in a conversation with the Scripture so that it can be tested and directed according to this its fundamental narrative.[32] Thus seen, the process of telling and transmitting the story of God can further be characterized as a continual process of a kind of rereading of Scripture. Interpretation belongs to the telling of God's story as immanently as does diversity, and rereading the authoritative Scripture belongs to remembering the conversational character of the Christian truth that is to be embodied in the life of the virtuous community.

There is one aspect to the testing of the community's memory against Scripture that should be noted here. For Hauerwas, remembering in this context is not about exclusively embracing those passages that resonate with one's own interests or with what one is willing to hear. It also and especially includes not forgetting those other passages, some of which one might be quite keen indeed to dismiss in all silence.[33] Because of this it is crucial that the church "can never be content with using just one part of Scripture, but must struggle day in and day out with the full text. For the story the church must tell as well as embody is a many-sided tale which

[30] Hauerwas 1983, 70.
[31] Hauerwas 1983, 45-46, 70, 97-98, 119-121, 131-134.
[32] Hauerwas 1983, 70-71, 98, 133-134.
[33] Hauerwas 1983, 30-31, 70, 98.

constantly calls us from complacency and conventions."[34] As Hauerwas sees it, to allow Scripture to have authority in all its diversity is at the same time to allow it to form one's identity and character through remembering what one wants to forget. In that way, memory becomes a moral exercise, because "[t]o acknowledge the authority of Scripture is also to learn to acknowledge our sin and accept forgiveness."[35] Forgiveness becomes thus the precondition for accepting Scripture as that "irreplaceable source of the stories that train us to be a faithful people"[36] and as such authoritative in its entirety. In this perspective, the fact of a fixed canon acquires a normative value, which poses Hauerwas stance in an interesting contrast to the reality of Rewritten Bible research discussed below.

Before we turn to that discussion, however, one more aspect is relevant to point out about Hauerwas's concept of memory. As we saw above, the Bible alone does not suffice as direction for a community that lives for telling God's tale. A proper telling, and remembering, of God's story also requires the example of the saints.[37] The story of God is to be embodied in the virtuous character of the community, faithful to its God and its own narrative.

> Therefore, Christians claim or attribute authority to Scripture because it is the irreplaceable source of the stories that train us to be a faithful people. To remember, we require not only historical-critical skills, but examples of people whose lives have been formed by that memory. The authority of Scripture is mediated through the lives of the saints identified by our community as most nearly representing what we are about. Put more strongly, to know what Scripture means, finally, we must look to those who have most nearly learned to exemplify its demands through their lives.[38]

In this passage, Hauerwas's ethical agenda is clearly manifest. Because telling for him, and thus interpretation itself, is a concrete, bodily action of ethics, it is the lives of people ascribed a

[34] Hauerwas 1983, 98.
[35] Hauerwas 1983, 70.
[36] Hauerwas 1983, 70.
[37] See 2.1.1. above.
[38] Hauerwas 1983, 70. As we can see, Hauerwas does not only intend the explicit honoring of certain people as saints as found in Catholic or Orthodox Christianity. Instead, a saint for him is anyone whose life story is worth remembering because of its virtue of corresponding to God's story. However, not anyone can be regarded as a saint regardless of community—this is why not all the Orthodox, Catholic, and Protestant saints are the same. In Hauerwas's view this fact does not, however, contradict the claim of a virtuous life for each of these saints within/through their communities. Such an understanding of virtue not as unity but as something diverse, perfectly corresponds to the many-sided and non-absolute nature of Scripture as the image of the story of God—the very one that is to be embodied by the church through the people who form her.

particularly virtuous value that most effectively explain the meaning of Scripture. Despite the explicitly action-oriented standpoint, I find the structure of the dynamics between Scripture, community, and saints illuminating for the discussion on Rewritten Bible and its implications for a methodology of analyzing biblical narrations outside the Bible itself. Especially interesting from this perspective would be to explore the possibility of paralleling these dynamics with those between Scripture, community, and rewriting in the discussion below.

2.2 Rewritten Bible: An Overview

The term "rewritten Bible" first appears in Geza Vermes's work in the field of Judaistic studies *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies* from 1961, as is remarked in most of the contributions discussed here.[39] The famous passage cited as the first "definition" of the concept is to be found in the second part of the book, titled "The Rewritten Bible," and reads as follows:

> Finally, this examination of the Yashar[40] story fully illustrates what is meant by the term 'rewritten Bible'. In order to anticipate questions, and to solve problems in advance, the midrashist[41] inserts haggadic[42] development into the biblical narrative – an exegetical process which is probably as ancient as scriptural interpretation itself. The Palestinian

[39] Campbell 2014, 49; Koskenniemi & Lindqvist 2008, 11; Laato 2010, 1, Petersen 2014, 15, 20; Valve 2014, 18; Vermes 2014, 3; White Crawford 2014, 105; Zahn 2014, 1, note 2.
[40] "Yashar story" here refers to the medieval Hebrew midrash, *Sefer haYashar* ('The Book of Righteousness'), first published in Venice in 1544, but dated to the 13th century CE. It is an ethical text that in its first part attempts to explain why God created both the wicked and the righteous. This part also includes a description of the Creation. (Dan 2007, 240-241).
[41] See note 12 above in 2.1.1.
[42] *Haggadah* ('story') means the elements of Rabbinic literature that are not *halakhah* ('law'). Haggadah includes theology, parables, acts of rabbis, and other stories about exemplary action (Lindqvist 2011, 283).

> Targum[43] and Jewish Antiquities,[44] Ps.-Philo[45] and Jubilees,[46] and the recently discovered 'Genesis Apocryphon'[47] [...], each in their own way show how the Bible was rewritten about a millenium before the redaction of Sefer ha-Yashar.[48]

Since this preliminary notion of Vermes's, "Rewritten Bible" has been vividly used in Biblical research as a label for different kinds of characterizations of (mostly antique) literature as we will see in the discussions below.

In his opening words for the 50th anniversary conference of Rewritten Bible, Vermes expresses his shock of "the realization that the notion, which over fifty years ago I thought was quite clear, seemed to the majority of the more recent practitioners nebulous and confused, and lacked methodological precision."[49] However, several commentators[50] quite rightly remark that Vermes does not offer as clear a definition in the initial context as he 50 years later states to have intended. Indeed: no strict definition, not to mention in generic terms, can be cited from *Scripture and Tradition*—what comes closest is a description of "an exegetical process" presumed as "probably as ancient as scriptural interpretation itself" and accompanied by a list of Jewish writings in which this process manifests itself, covering a time span from the Second

---

[43] *Palestinian Targum* is one corpus belonging to the family of *targumim*, that is, Aramaic translations of the Hebrew Bible. The most important Palestinian Pentateuch Targums are *Codex Neofiti I*, *Targum Yerushalmi I* (also known as *Pseudo-Jonathan*), and *Targum Yerushalmi II* (the so-called *Fragmentary Targum*) (Lindqvist 2011, 186; Grossfeld & Sperling 2007, 588-589, 591-592).

[44] *Jewish Antiquities* is one of the Jewish historian Flavius Josephus' works, written in Greek in 93/94 CE and giving in its 20 books an account on the history of the Jewish people from the Creation to the revolt against Romans. The earliest major manuscripts of the text known today date to 10th-11th century CE (Feldman 2013, 18-19).

[45] *Ps.-Philo* is a name used for the anonymous author of a work called *Book of Biblical Antiquities* (also: *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum, L.A.B.*) dated to 70-150 CE, originally written in Hebrew but preserved in a Latin translation of a Greek version only. It is this book that Vermes most likely refers to here. The text of *L.A.B*. gives an account of the Biblical narrative from Adam to David, making use of both Biblical and extra-Biblical material. (Jacobson 2013, 470-471).

[46] *Book of Jubilees*, dated by most scholars to the early 2nd century BCE, is originally a Jewish religious text written in Hebrew. It was later translated into Greek and Syriac by Christian recipients and then from Greek into Latin and Ge'ez. The composition presents Genesis and the first part of Exodus as a revelation from God, mediated by an Angel of the Presence. *Jubilees* constantly refers to jubilees when assigning the dates for Biblical events, which is also reflected by its original and much longer name that was shortened to only *Jubilees*. The *Book of Jubilees* seems to be interdependent with 1 Enoch (Kugel 2013, 272-274).

[47] *Genesis Apocryphon* is one of the original manuscripts found in Qumran Cave 1. This single manuscript only preserves a part of the whole work. The first major publication of its contents occurred in the 1950s, just before Vermes *Scripture and Tradition* first came out in [give the date]. It only presents part of the available text. The rest of the fragments were published during the 1990s, but a complete edition of the whole scroll was only published in 2009. The scroll itself has been dated to the 1st century BCE and the text between 1st and 3rd and centuries BCE. *Genesis Apocryphon* contains both first and third person accounts by and of such biblical figures as Lamech, Noah, and Abraham (Morgenstern & Segal 2013, 237-239).

[48] Vermes 1961, 95.

[49] Vermes 2014, 3.

[50] Campbell 2014, 64; Koskenniemi & Lindqvist 2008, 11-12; Laato 2010, 1; Petersen 2014, 20; Valve 2014, 18.

Temple Period well into the later Middle Ages.[51] Even though Vermes himself continued to develop a generic definition in the aftermath of his seminal study, and still sticks to it, he softens his perspective in his new writing and recognizes a combination of both views, i.e., Rewritten Bible as genre and as an exegetical process, as legitimate.[52]

Vermes's own reflections only illustrate the ambiguity of the implications derivable from his original use of the term and its consequences in subsequent scholarship. In his analysis of the historical development of Rewritten Bible debate, Anders Klostergaard Petersen detects "two very different trajectories"[53] at work in the current debate: an increasing number of texts included in the category on the one hand, and an increasing skepticism towards its usefulness on the other. The same themes are repeatedly taken up when scholars describe the field. The question about the definition—whether Rewritten Bible should be understood as a genre or as a process—dominates the discussion as far as the number and type of texts included is concerned.[54] This disagreement on definition, in turn, results in a certain resentment among scholars regarding the usefulness of the phrase in scholarly context.

---

[51] Vermes 1961, 95. Thus, Valve (2014, 18) maintains that, due to the function of the concept "Rewritten Bible" in its initial context, where it is characterized as "exegetical process" by Vermes himself, it is best understood to describe "first and foremost a technique."

[52] Vermes 2014, 8. In his opening speech, Vermes seems to embrace an understanding of "Rewritten Bible" as a textual process resulting in a literary genre. See also Petersen 2014, 21.

[53] Petersen 2014, 24.

[54] Brooke 2014, 119-120; Campbell 2014, 50-58, 64-69; Koskenniemi & Lindqvist 2006, 12-15; Laato 2008, 1-3; Valve 2014, 18-22; White Crawford 2014, 106. According to Brooke, this field currently covers three groups of researchers: those who consider Rewritten Scripture/Bible a genre; those preferring an understanding as "a set of phenomena that are observable in various compositions"; and those who seek to combine these two perspectives, talking about "characteristic features of Mosaic discourse" or describing "how a range of compositions enlarge and enhance the suitable description of scriptural exegesis in the Second Temple period." (Brooke 2014, 120.) Brooke himself obviously sympathizes to the latter two perspectives, which is confirmed by Lotta Valve, as she cites his understanding of the concept as "a general umbrella term describing the particular kind of intertextual activity that always gives priority to one text over another." (Brooke, 2000. "Rewritten Bible." In: Schiffman & VanderKam, (eds.). *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: Oxford University Press. Vol. 2. p. 780b; cited in Valve 2014, 20**)**. Valve similarly maintains a basic distinction between Rewritten Bible as a literary genre in succession of Vermes, and as an interpretative process, characterized as "roughly synonymous with biblical interpretation" (Valve 2014, 20). As examples of different nuances on this broader understanding, she mentions, in addition to Brooke, Daniel Harrington, for whom Rewritten Bible is "a kind of activity or process," and Antti Laato and Jacques van Ruiten, who characterize the term as a "wide umbrella covering the different types of afterlife of the biblical material" (Harrington. 1986. "The Bible Rewritten (Narratives)" In: Kraft & Nickelsburg (eds.). *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters.* Atlanta: Scholars. p. 243; Laato & van Ruiten (eds.). 2008. *Rewritten Bible Reconsidered: Proceedings of the Conference in Karkku, Finland August 24-26 2006.* SRB 1. Turku & Winona Lake: Åbo Akademi University & Eisenbraun. p. 2; cited in Valve 2014, 20).

2.2.1 Shift of Paradigm

That the question of the meaning and relevance of the Rewritten Bible concept has become a subject for interest, concern, and questioning in recent scholarship has to do with its historical context. Antti Laato characterizes Rewritten Bible as a scholarly meta-level term that in its initial context reflects a fundamental shift of paradigm in Biblical scholarship: "a shift from historical-critical exegesis which produces one normative interpretation to the interpretive world where the biblical text is constantly interpreted and reworked."[55] The fundamental explanations of this paradigm shift are the expansive literary findings in Qumran caves which had played a significant role already for Vermes's earlier career. According to him, the original context and use of the notion of Rewritten Bible was to show the historicity of the haggadic exegesis, "that is to say the study of the narrative and doctrinal elements in Bible interpretation"—an idea provoked by the publication of the Genesis Apocryphon.[56] In contrast to halakhah[57] that explicitly claims to be a tradition transmitted by historical persons, the haggadic exegesis of narrative character does not often make such references. Vermes's aim was to shed light on the issue by showing traits of exegetical processes similar to rabbinic midrash in texts dating from times prior to and after the composition of the rabbinic corpora.

The originally intended scope was thus restricted neither exclusively to Qumran, nor to Second Temple literature only.[58] Vermes's larger agenda of showing the historicity of Haggadah also explains the exclusively narrative character of the exemplary texts appearing in *Scripture and Tradition*.[59] However, the development soon took unexpected directions. Petersen divides the development of Rewritten Bible scholarship into four phases,[60] fourth of which is his analysis of the current situation that I already mentioned above. Petersen's first phase dates from 1961 to the mid-eighties, including in it the first occurrence of the phrase and Vermes's own

---

[55] Laato 2010, 5.
[56] Vermes 2014, 7.
[57] *Halakhah* ('law') means teaching about righteous life in the Jewish tradition more broadly or in a sense of specific orders. Thus, it is best characterized as legal exegesis in this context (Lindqvist 2011, 184). See also note 42 above.
[58] Laato 2010, 6; Petersen 2014, 20; Vermes 2014, 8; White Crawford 2014, 105.
[59] Koskenniemi & Lindqvist 2014, 20; Petersen 2014, 22, 24; Valve 2014, 18; Vermes 2014, 8. Valve's indicates that Vermes primarily developed his concept with these sort of texts in mind. Vermes himself admits this by referring to the framework of Haggadic studies within this his seminal research (Vermes 1961.) However, in his writing from 2014 he is more open as to the type of texts to be included and even goes as far as to proclaim that "future treatment of the 'Rewritten Bible' should include the whole field of Jewish Bible interpretation." (Vermes 2014, 8.)
[60] Petersen 2014, 19-27.

adjustments to it towards a concept of a literary genre.[61] As the Charlesworth Pseudepigrapha project[62] unearthed increasing numbers of nonbiblical Qumran texts in the following years, the debate of the correct understanding of Rewritten Bible as a concept altered accordingly. As a second phase from 1984 to the mid-nineties, Petersen sees the polarization of the views of Rewritten Bible as a genre versus a textual process due to the different focus of the scholars on one. [63] Petersen's third phase from the mid-nineties to the millennium witnessed the publication of the expansive amounts of Qumran material, especially from Cave Four, directing the focus of Rewritten Bible research almost exclusively to those texts.

The concept thus being hardly separable from its close connection to developments in Qumran research, its emergence is located at a phase that has proved revolutionary for the whole field of Biblical scholarship. Sidnie White Crawford describes this climactic role of the cave findings:

> In the beginning, BQ or Before Qumran, there was order, there was certainty, there was "biblical" and there was "nonbiblical." We knew what was what, and we could fit everything into our categories. There was "Apocrypha," and there was "Pseudepigrapha," and they weren't "Bible," and we all knew how to tell the difference. AQ, or After Qumran, those certainties began to break down.[64]

White Crawford thus maintains that the new information from Qumran scrolls increasingly showed a flux of variable traditions and forms in writings from the Second Temple period, which could not be unambiguously sorted in the existing categories. In this way, they marked a turn in the research that moved scholars to develop new theories to supplement, or substitute these. Laato translates White Crawford's merely poetic remark on the confusion of the biblical

---

[61] White Crawford 2014, 105. In his later article, Vermes maintains that the characteristics of the genre "Rewritten Bible" are the following: "a close attachment in narrative and themes, to some book contained in the present Jewish canon of Scripture, and some type of reworking, whether through rearrangement, conflation, or supplementation, of the present canonical text" (Vermes. 1989. ”Bible Interpretation at Qumran." (*Eretz Israel* 20), pp. 185-186; cited in Crawford 2014, 105). The attached list of works includes the *Book of Jubilees*, the *Genesis Apocryphon*, Josephus' *Antiquities*, and Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, thus leaving out the 13th century *Sefer ha-Yashar* and the *Palestinian Targum* and, consequently, deciding the orientation of the future application predominantly on Second Temple material.

[62] Working on an edition of Qumran texts not belonging to the Hebrew Bible canon by James L. Charlesworth that was to result in two volumes of *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* in 1983.

[63] See also Valve 2014, 20. In her view, the difference consists in the focus being moved to interpretative techniques themselves in the latter understanding, instead of rather classifying texts that use these, as in the former case.

[64] White Crawford 2014, 105.

in times "AQ" further in three indicators characteristic for the shift: the awareness of, firstly, inner-biblical exegesis, secondly, the continual reworking of biblical texts, and thirdly, the "continual rereading process in antiquity,"[65] meaning biblical interpretation. Each of these aspects serve, according to Laato, as a clue for a complex reality, where there were as few single authoritative texts not literally interdependent as there were normative interpretations of this plethora of texts.

It is in the context of this complex reality now being a normative point of departure in an analysis of Jewish (and other) texts from the antiquity that White Crawford, too, sees the original and appropriate place of Vermes's first mention of what was to develop into the concept(s) of Rewritten Bible. Describing Vermes as "one of the pioneers who recognized that the old categories were no longer adequate with his description of the phenomenon he called 'Rewritten Bible',"[66] White Crawford ascribes to Vermes's original concept a role as merely a marker of a new era. Laato shows further that even Vermes himself seems to have been aware of the significance of his original study as he proclaims "a new era opened in the study of Jewish biblical exegesis" as a result of the Qumran findings, and that subsequently "the antiquity of the haggadah now appears in an entirely different perspective."[67]

2.2.2 Comment

According to my observations, the scholarship on the "Rewritten Bible" today shows strong tendencies *ad fontes*. Whatever the developments of the past, overall confusion regarding the "real meaning" of the phrase today drives scholars to seek an understanding that takes Vermes's original concept seriously. This is done either synchronically by concentrating on the use of the term in its initial context in *Scripture and Tradition*, or diachronically by drawing the conclusions from the adjusted view developed in Vermes's further work.

To continue with Laato and White Crawford as outstanding examples, the former represents the synchronic approach to the question as he takes Vermes's first mentioning of the term "rewritten Bible" as his point of departure to then deduce how it is to be used and understood.

[65] Laato 2010, 5.
[66] White Crawford 2014, 105.
[67] Vermes 1961, 5-6; cited in Laato 2010, 3-4.

The notion that Vermes's original term was much more open and intuitive than has been expressed in later discussion is of crucial importance for Laato. This notion indicates that it may not have been completely clear for Vermes himself in an articulate way what he wished the combination "rewritten Bible" to signify in its initial context and that, consequently, Vermes's later definitions might also have missed the point he initially wished to make. According to Laato's reading, the point was to claim the existence of textual processes that can be present in a much wider range of text forms/genres found in Vermes's list of examples than has been allowed in much of the subsequent scholarly discussion.[68] Highlighting Vermes's notion of how all these texts "in their own way show how the Bible was rewritten,"[69] Laato concludes that a proper understanding of "Rewritten Bible" embraces these original riches of textual range and cannot be restricted to only a certain group of texts of arbitrary choice.

If it is the notion of intuitiveness that justifies Laato's choice of the discussions in *Scripture and Tradition* as his exclusive authority when searching for a meaning for the category[70], White Crawford's approach is very different. As a representative for the diachronic way of understanding the proper reading of the concept, she draws on a later definition of Vermes's in her argumentation.[71] In contrast to Laato, it is not to revive *Vermes's* original concept that White Crawford is searching for its meaning, but to show its need for an update in the face of the complex transmission history of Pentateuchal manuscripts found in Qumran. Nonetheless, the way she deals with the Vermesian source material indicates that she assumes that Vermes's definitions of the "Rewritten Bible" are rightly understood together as a reflected whole where later adjustments correct and substitute earlier notions. White Crawford thus understands Rewritten Bible as a genre of ancient literature appropriated by Vermes whose understanding of it, however, needs to be further adjusted to match the current state of knowledge in the research field. In so doing she represents a hermeneutic fundamentally different rfom Laato's; whereas the latter gives priority to the intuitive in the immanent context of occurrence of the subject under definition, the former lays the weight on later adjustments of the author(itative person).

[68] Laato 2010, 1.
[69] Vermes 1961, 95; cited in Laato 2010, 1.
[70] Laato 2010, 1-2, note 3.
[71] See note 61 above.

I suggest that this hermeneutical difference constitutes much of the disagreement on defining the concept of “Rewritten Bible” in general. It also has far-reaching consequences for how different scholars come to evaluate the usefulness of the term and to direct the focus of their research related to it as we will see in the following discussion on the heuristic value of the Rewritten Bible concept.

2.3 The Search for a Heuristic Value

When discussing the heuristic value of “Rewritten Bible” it becomes clear from where the two trajectories diagnosed by Petersen[72] come. Both represent ways to cope with the fact that the original concept developed by Vermes seems to have been brought to its end by the very same phenomenon of textual variety in Qumran findings that once gave it its rise. As we already saw, the ambiguity concerning the proper understanding of Rewritten Bible designating a genre versus a textual process constitutes one problem in finding a relevant use for the concept in textual analysis. Another issue that puzzles scholars today is the combination of Rewritten *Bible* that implicitly assumes both a distinct Jewish biblical canon and other independent non-biblical works that rewrite this assumed canon. In the face of the fully published material from Qumran, however, both assumptions start to appear problematic.[73] Even though Vermes himself considers the state of Jewish canon formation to be such as to render it unproblematic to continue with the original phrase[74], many scholars abandon this approach as unfruitful and substitute the original with “Rewritten *Scripture*.”[75] Yet, even this influential solution has its critics.[76] Our following discussion will show that the choice of terminology many times is a strategic one in the search for a heuristic value of the concept.

Roughly speaking, it can be stated that each scholar’s answer to the question about Rewritten Bible/Scripture as a genre or as a process also decides how they position themselves regarding the heuristic value of the concept. Their chosen stance defines not only the possibilities but also and primarily the systematic locus of Rewritten Bible/Scripture in their research. To treat

[72] See under 2.2 above.
[73] Campbell 2014, 51, 58-60; Petersen 2014, 24; White Crawford 2014, 105-106.
[74] Vermes 2014, 8.
[75] Thus Brooke 2014; Petersen 2014; Ulrich 2014; Zahn 2011. For the issue in general, see Campbell 2014, 50, 58-64; Petersen 2014, 24-25; Valve 2014, 18, note 4; White Crawford 2014, 106; Zahn 2011, 1, note 2.
[76] See Campbell 2014, 61-64.

Rewritten Bible/Scripture as a genre demands first and foremost that the criteria of the genre should be defined before the concept is usable as an analytical tool. Since an activity of this kind inevitably implicates an assumption of an existing genre, this approach has been harshly criticized as a circular argumentation[77] and should, in fact, continuously question and modify itself vis-à-vis the available text material when carried out responsibly. Hence, understanding Rewritten Bible/Scripture as a genre eventually must render defining the concept itself the actual goal of the study. Good examples of this approach are White Crawford and Molly M. Zahn who both take their starting point in Pentateuchal Qumran material as the key for understanding Rewritten Bible/Scripture. Those choosing to refuse the generic approach, on the other hand, are not obliged to respect any hypothetically existent genre and are thus free to evaluate Rewritten Bible/Scripture directly according to its potential as an analytical tool in studying ancient (and/or other) literature. This evaluation, then, can lead either to rejection of the phrase as unsuitable altogether[78] or to affirmation of its heuristic value. Such affirmative suggestions are found, e.g., in Laato and Petersen and often rely on breaking down former conventions.

Differences in focus, intention, and the degree of problematization of individual scholars notwithstanding, there are some predominant aspects that characterize the overall discussion in my sources and present notable parallels to Hauerwas's concept of the relationship between the Bible and its reading community. I have gathered these aspects under two main categories: authority and rereading.

2.3.1 Authority

That there is an aspect of authority inherent in the concept of Rewritten Bible/Scripture seems to enjoy unreflective acceptance among scholars; yet, as one can expect, how this authority is concretely understood varies from scholar to scholar. In the following, I introduce both generic

[77] E.g., Brooke (2014, 119) and Campbell (2014, 56-57) note that Rewritten Scripture as a genre is often based on a circular argumentation, where the characteristics of a narrow scale of certain works define the demarcation of the genre.

[78] Campbell (2014, 76-77) recommends de-coupling the word pair Rewritten Bible/Scripture in order to maximize the concept's heuristic value. In this way, rewriting as a process would be separated from the type of a text as scriptural or biblical so that other texts, too, could "be described as *Rewritten Sectarian Work* or *Rewritten Popular Narrative*." Ultimately, Campbell holds that it could be useful "at least temporarily, to put on hold Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture language altogether."

and more process-oriented points of view on the question and show how they can be related to Hauerwas's thought.

Living Tradition

Of those preferring a generic understanding of the concept I have chosen to look at the aspect of authority in White Crawford's, Zahn's, and Eugene Ulrich's views. All three authors unite in refuting the original "Rewritten" Bible due to the apparent fluidity and complexity of canon formation in Second Temple Judaism and use "Rewritten Scripture" instead.[79] They also share the intuitive attachment of the aspect of authority to the term Scripture/scriptural. However, whereas White Crawford pleads for abandoning the attribute (non)biblical altogether, Zahn finds use for that category as a technical term in her system as we will see. Further differences can be detected regarding the texts included in the research; both White Crawford and Zahn recommend using Pentateuchal material as a tool to understand the rewriting of authoritative texts in the Second Temple period, whereas Ulrich also includes the Prophets as well as Psalms and Daniel. According to him, all these texts were already recognized as sacred in the early Second Temple period and can thus be unproblematically regarded as such, since they are preserved in both the (Qumran) Scrolls, Masoretic Text, Samaritan Pentateuch, and Septuagint, all equally circulating and in use at that time.[80]

Also, the respective approaches to the definition of the Rewritten Scripture differ between these scholars. White Crawford's proposal is Rewritten Scripture as a continual spectrum of texts witnessing to an increasing number of changes introduced. In contrast to her, both Zahn and Ulrich maintain a concept of Rewritten Scripture as a genre to be clearly distinguished from biblical editions, however with different criteria. Ulrich operates with a list of approved changes not too different from the already conventional one, provided by Philip Alexander,[81] whereas

[79] Ulrich 2014, 83. Similarly to White Crawford, according to Eugene Ulrich there is no such thing as "Rewritten Bible," since all the books in Hebrew Bible have a complex evolution behind them. He maintains this to be one of the "two undisputed facts" he analyzes among the recent biblical scholarship, the other of which being the existence of additional interpretative compositions other than, but contemporaneous to, biblical books, labeled by him "Rewritten Scripture."

[80] Ulrich 2014, 84.

[81] Alexander's approach has become a classic in Rewritten Bible research. He is cited in Campbell 2014, 52; Koskenniemi & Lindqvist 2008, 13-4. Ulrich (2014, 93) maintains a distinction between Scripture and Rewritten Scripture, adding to them one more category, which he calls "(Rewritten) Pre-Scripture." By "Pre-Scripture" he means the textual development of the biblical books before they became considered a sacred Scripture in the Second Temple period. By distinguishing between two different statuses of a book either as literature or as Scripture, he seeks to demonstrate how the same features typical for "Rewritten Scripture" can be found in "Pre-

Zahn wants to identify recurring technique-purpose combinations in order to find a better-defined way of categorizing texts as Rewritten Scripture or not.[82] These different approaches are decisive for the way in which each of the scholars structures the dynamics between authority, rewriting, and Scripture as will be shown in the following.

We first look at White Crawford's definition in more detail since it demonstrates well some notable parallels to Hauerwas's use of language. To understand White Crawford's thought it is useful to bear in mind her affirmative reaction to deconstructing the concept of *Bible* to merely authoritative *Scripture*, or in her case even Scripture*s* in the plural.[83] In contrast to the disliked categories of "biblical" and "nonbiblical", White Crawford describes her own understanding of rewriting Scriptures as

> a spectrum of texts, in which we witness faithful scribes doing exegesis on an authoritative parent text in order to pass on living tradition. This spectrum of texts begins at one end with an unexpanded, "short" text, moves through a range of expansions, and reaches recognizably new compositions. Throughout the spectrum the expanded text claims equal authority with its parent text.[84]

This definition can not only be stated to crystallize White Crawford's understanding of both rewriting and Scripture/s—namely, as an inseparable, mutually interrelated pair—but the role played by authority as well. It is the authority that stands in the heart of this mutual union; the rewriting means "faithful scribes doing exegesis on an authoritative parent text [*i.e.* a Scripture]," and these together form a "living tradition," throughout the whole range of compositional stages of the exegesis.

Scripture" in contrast to Scripture, so that, in the end, two different scales of rewriting can be identified—one inside the boundaries of what is acknowledged as Scripture, resulting at best in new editions; another, producing new religious literature without, at first, any claims to be regarded as scriptural.

[82] Zahn 2011, 7-12, 229, 233. With a genuine Second Temple genre in mind, Zahn refuses to leave the distinction between the different categories to depend on any scholar's personal preferences or gut feeling in judging the amounts of essentially incomparable kinds of changes. The ultimate results of these analyses could then be used to determine possible technique-purpose combinations typical for rewritten Scripture compositions. Instead, she wants to show a connection between the goals of the rewriters in Second Temple Judaism and the techniques they used when undertaking the changes. In her study, Zahn aims at showing an example of a careful analysis of the occurrences of different compositional techniques [e.g., additions, rearrangements] the Second Temple scribes used, as well as of the purposes for which these techniques were used in the texts—a tool she finds to have been insufficiently used in the scholarship to date.

[83] See the title of her contribution in White Crawford 2014, 105.

[84] White Crawford 2014, 107.

Crucial for the whole picture, I believe, is White Crawford's effort in trying to understand the aspect of authority in the face of the fact that even the texts accepted as authoritative were obviously in a state of vivid flux in the Second Temple period. Her discussions on the Pentateuch suggest a shift where the rewriting, instead of being rewriting of a single authoritative base text resulting in new compositions on their own (what she criticizes Vermes for, as seen above), is *subordinated under the roof of authority with, and constitutive to, the Scriptures*. Under the premises of rejecting the distinction between "biblical" and "nonbiblical" as the old definitions suggested, *the flux of the (authoritative) Scriptures must itself be understood as acts of rewriting, the essential function of which is transmission of authority*. Thus, "Rewritten Scriptures" as this complex held together with the inbound sense of authority, can be analyzed and described as a spectrum of texts with variable degrees of reworking.

Despite the different framework, parallels in language are striking to Hauerwas above. White Crawford's faithful scribes call to mind Hauerwas's faithful people who through their action aim at showing what their sacred Scripture is all about. Even though White Crawford views the process as specifically one of textual exegesis whereas Hauerwas emphasizes the lived lives of the devout, these two should not be taken as mutually exclusive. Rather, the textual exegesis integrates in the life of the community as a part of the living tradition which both this exegesis and the life more broadly represent. No less is the textual exegesis a manifestation of the underlying virtues (or vices) embodied in it than is the concrete life of the community itself. Thus seen, the lived lives of the communities can, in turn, be described in terms of Rewritten Bible—more accurately when from Hauerwas's point of view there is a fixed canon exercising a negative control on the interpretations made of God's story.

The constitutive role of the canon as the form of God's story in Hauerwas's thought also constitutes the main challenge for the compatibility of his narrative ethics with Rewritten Bible concept as will be shown in greater depth below under the aspect of rereading. Here the partial compatibility of White Crawford's view with Hauerwas's should be defended (vai recognized?), despite the apparent differences. As we saw, White Crawford ultimately refutes any form of acknowledging a category of biblical texts. Instead, not only do "Rewritten *Scriptures*" bear authority without having a fixed form but constitute a flux of living tradition sharing in that authority. This "fact" also implies that all Scriptures in the Second Temple period were essentially "*Rewritten* Scriptures," that is, part of that flux of rewriting the authoritative

traditions. As a description of the Rewritten Bible, however, this dynamic concept well captures a feel of conversational attitude towards the sacred truth and its transmission, like what we saw was the very foundation of Hauerwas's ethics.

Literature, and the saints

A somewhat different approach to Scripture than White Crawford's can be identified in both Ulrich and Zahn, even though they both seem to share White Crawford's view of all Scripture being in some way rewritten and constantly re-edited without their authority being questioned. Ulrich and Zahn both maintain a clearer distinction between Scripture and Rewritten Scripture than White Crawford does and, in their views, authority is thus more strictly bound to a certain base text which then lends its authority to a new composition. As Ulrich acknowledges, "a certain book recognized as scriptural was an important fundamental work to use as a basis for, and lend authority to, an updated interpretation,"[85] and had the power to "steer current and future interpretative views in a certain direction."[86] In contrast to White Crawford's more overarching concept of authority, Ulrich locates authority in a distinct group of texts which are called Scripture and testify to only moderate reworking in the early Second Temple period. This authority, then, is used by authors writing their interpretations in the form of religious literature to legitimate their work with it and to make their message plausibly compatible and appealing for their readers who were assumed to share the sacred tradition. Zahn's approach is relatively similar, but for her, the authoritative (*i.e.,* scriptural) position of a text is *intended by the scribe through certain kinds of changes* in composition. Thus, for her, to find out what a genre called rewritten scripture may have been requires that one manages to associate the changes found in a text with their proper intentions.[87]

What is interesting for the purpose of this thesis is that there seem to be two distinctions at work in both Ulrich's and Zahn's conceptions regarding the authority of rewritten texts. First, there is the distinction between Scripture and Rewritten Scripture as literary forms, the former being authoritative and subject to only relatively moderate reworkings, then lending authority to the latter. Second, a distinction is made between, on the one hand, the identity of the rewritten text

[85] Ulrich 2014, 83.
[86] Ulrich 2014, 83.
[87] Zahn 2011, 11. As she (ibid. 239) admits, her study does not yet provide any certain implications to such results due to its restricted scope in comparing only the five reworked Pentateuch mss with the Samaritan Pentateuch and Temple Scroll, but she hopes to have given an impulse for further examination on the topic.

as a rewriting of an authoritative parent and, on the other, its own status as scriptural—*i.e.,* having authority due to its sacredness.

For Ulrich, the first distinction is essentially one between two phases of a book's path to being acknowledged as Scripture, of which phases the second one, i.e., identifying as Scripture, may never occur for some texts. Furthermore, this distinction is particularly important for him, as he means it to be helpful for illuminating the boundary between Scripture and "Rewritten Scripture" in the Second Temple period. As he himself maintains, "[a]pparently, broader freedom was used when dealing with 'literature,' but more restricted freedom was used when dealing with 'Scripture.'"[88] In fact, Ulrich supplements the distinction between Scripture and "Rewritten Scripture" with the concept of "(Rewritten) Pre-Scripture," comparable in form to Rewritten Scripture. In his view, all books were first considered as religious literature and only some of them were ascribed a scriptural status at some point in the series of rewritings. Thus, Ulrich seems to argue that different criteria must be used to judge whether a text is Rewritten Scripture or Scripture, respectively; clues for the first are to be found in the text itself, whereas the latter must be discovered by indicators outside the text, such as quotations as an authoritative text, or, more ambiguously, the number of copies found.

In comparison to Zahn, Ulrich's two distinctions find their parallel in the former's use of the words (non)biblical and (non)scriptural. This is demonstrated in her characterization of the Temple Scroll[89] and Jubilees[90] as "non-biblical (though quite probably scriptural!) compositions."[91] (Non)biblical in this understanding denotes thus the intention behind the reworking—whether the resulting text is meant only to offer an updated edition of the biblical text, in this way still remaining itself biblical, or to constitute a new composition— whereas (non)scriptural illustrates the authority the result of reworking had in the community among which it was read. Due to the crucial role Zahn ascribes the intention of the authors/editors in classifying a text as rewritten Scripture, a slightly different emphasis can be detected from Ulrich. For Zahn, the original purpose of rewriting defines its (non)biblical or (non)scriptural status. Whereas Ulrich seeks to find the boundaries between literature and scripture on a

[88] Ulrich 2014, 95.
[89] *Temple Scroll* is the longest scroll found in Qumran, and it has been dated to the 2nd century BCE. The scroll merges material from all the five books of Pentateuch and harmonized into one law. It also contains revelations from God to Moses about how the Jerusalem temple should have been built. Apparently, the text has been written in a script reserved for copying Biblical material in Qumran. (Schiffman 2013, 3036-7; Yadin 2007, 633).
[90] See note 46 above in 2.2.
[91] Zahn 2011, 10.

temporal line, then using statistical evidence to judge of the scriptural status of a text, Zahn operates with a close analysis of the texts themselves. Her focus is not on the development of a particular text or tradition as Ulrich's, but on the intended changes a scribe imposed on a text for a certain purpose.

Curiously, there are some parallels that can be drawn between the distinction of Scripture and Rewritten Bible and Hauerwas's concept of the lives of the saints. Because both Zahn and Ulrich in a sense maintain a distinction between biblical and nonbiblical, that is, assume a certain kind of canon of sacred texts, it is possible for them to draw a line between that canon and other works that interpret it. The fact that these latter works, which only borrow their authority from their antecedent in the first place, can at some point themselves acquire an equally authoritative status independent of their parent text offers an interesting subject for comparison. For, in Hauerwas's view, God's story is embodied in faithful people's lives and, as we saw, the legitimacy of saints is based on their forming their own group of particularly faithful life stories among their community. In that way, lives of saints—whether already departed from this life or still living—embraced by a community can become a part of that community's sacred Scripture, or even substitute the Bible as the main reference of how a Christian life should be lived.

However, some essential differences should not be overseen when drawing this parallel. Firstly, what Zahn and Ulrich mean by the authority of the rewritten works is closer to Hauerwas's idea of the negative control over the Bible than the positive authority based on exemplarity that characterizes his concept of the saints. Because of this difference in type of authority, the lives of the saints can thus never in Hauerwas's view make claims on taking over a final and definite position in explaining Scripture but are relative to other life stories and equally subject to the negative control of Scripture. Related to that, even though rewritten compositions are implicitly directive to future interpretation, too, they still essentially represent an actualization of the thought of old in their own time and are thus in their inner dynamics focused on the relationship between (their) present and past. In contrast, what is crucial for Hauerwas's concept of embodiment is the aspect of future with roots in the need for continuous change in the ways of life of the community, as described above. In order for the changing character of the community to be reality in a present remembering and actualizing its past, the future is needed as a grant for the continuity of both the change and the community itself. Neither rewritten compositions

claiming scriptural authority nor the lives of the most faithful of saints can thus claim absolute authority isolated from the conversation of truth and the intergenerational story of God.

Authority

The central role of authority in the Rewritten Bible/Scripture discourse becomes particularly manifest when we look at the authors preferring an understanding of the concept as an exegetical or textual process. Since they are not bound to harmonize with any Second Temple Jewish genre, the aspect of authority can be used by them to move Rewritten Bible/Scripture outside of its initial context to serve a more clearly defined heuristic purpose. A rather radical example of this kind of approach is found in Petersen who de-contextualizes the idea of Rewritten Scripture from its roots in Jewish scholarship and applies it to texts in any contexts. Thus, Petersen wants to preserve the concept rewritten Scripture as a scholarly term but demands radical changes in its understanding to make it heuristically valuable. Basically, what he does, is on the one hand to cut the term off its Second Temple Jewish genre genesis to be able to apply it for rewriting taking place outside of this specific context. On the other hand, noting the certain rewritten character of all text production, he narrows down the perspective to comprise a specific kind of rewriting process. This process, then, is characterized by a specific kind of an authoritative relationship between the texts involved and a specific form of the rewritten composition, as shown in the following.

As indicated, it is in the aspect of authority that Petersen finds a theoretical perspective clear enough for the heuristic rehabilitation of rewritten Scripture. He even considers that there is more to gain than to lose when insisting on the concept as he states:

> I think there is good reason to hold on to the category as a scholarly term, since it may analytically, advantageously be taken to designate one particular and excessive type of intertextuality, namely the one that exists between an authoritative scriptural antecedent and its subsequent reuse in any type of rewriting.[92]

More precisely, this intertextuality is characterized by

[92] Petersen 2014, 30. This offers an interesting contrast to Campbell's de-coupling as the only way to make a heuristic win out of Rewritten Bible/Scripture, see note 78 above.

> a textual strategy by which any text rewrites one or more authoritative textual predecessors by closely following the structure of its base text(s), but without making explicit comments on the intertextual relationship that exists between them.[93]

The extremity of Petersen's approach shows in the way he combines the concepts of authority and intertextuality. Whereas most of the Rewritten Bible/Scripture scholars associate the authority involved with a religious one enjoyed by some texts within a Jewish community, Petersen chooses to describe an authority binding together any two texts whose mutual intertextual relationship faces the criteria of being structurally closely related without explicitly commenting the intertextuality of the two. With his definition, Petersen thus frees the concept of rewritten Scripture from restrictions in time and place by focusing on the authority involved in the intertextual relation of the base text and the rewritten composition. Taking into account that almost every text is some kind of a rewriting of authoritative texts, he can use the concept as a tool in analyzing, e.g., the reception of Virgil in Roman antiquity quite as well as some "biblical" stories rewritten, if only they follow the criteria of form and way of rewriting that he defines.

Concluding, the importance of authority in Rewritten Bible/Scripture discourse can hardly be underestimated. Despite the variety of application in different scholars' views, the fact remains that the aspect of authority seems to be systematically implicated and assumed by whomever discusses the concept Rewritten Bible/Scripture. This is good to keep in mind when we now turn to the aspect of rereading and explore further parallels between Hauerwas's system and the Rewritten Bible/Scripture distinction.

2.3.2 Rereading

While reading the more recent theoretical contributions to the idea of Rewritten Bible, I was struck by the conceptual compatibility between them and Hauerwas's dynamics of Bible, tradition, and memory in telling God's tale. Particularly illuminating in this sense were the essays of Laato, Brooke, and Schorch, of which the first one represents a more systematic presentation of a whole whereas the latter two hope to introduce less discussed phenomena into

[93] Petersen 2014, 31.

the overall discussion. I have considered the following aspects to be of particular relevance for the purpose of this thesis: Firstly, all three authors thematize the *individual* as a reader of an authoritative text, as a participant in an authoritative tradition. Secondly, they also make a point of the complex *interdependence* between the individual and her social contexts as well as religious or other traditions she partakes. Thirdly, especially Brooke's and Laato's reflections offer an account of this *context-embedded individual's effort to make sense of the reality of her tradition in the changing social reality around her*, harmonizing these realities into one "way of looking at the world" (Brooke) or "referential world," (Laato) which then can find its expression in a textual form. By virtue of observing the individual's place in being part of the transmitted traditions I have chosen to collect these aspects under the heading of rereading.

Re-*reading*

The first aspect considering rewriting as a manifestation of rereading is a very practical one, namely, the issue of vocalization of the consonantal Hebrew text introduced by Stefan Schorch. His aim is to show how Rewritten Bible research and the research on the vocalization of texts in Second Temple Judaism combined could gain from each other, contributing to understanding each phenomenon respectively. As a possible key, Schorch suggests examining how alternative vocalizations of the consonant texts relate to what he calls the Rewritten Bible genre throughout the article.[94] Ultimately, Schorch's message is very straightforward:

> Generally, one should realize that vocalization has been a factor of no less importance—as a source, a point of departure, or a matter of discussion—than the consonantal framework in both the course of textual transmission and the process of re-writing of Biblical compositions.[95]

Such equal attention to both the consonantal text and its alternative vocalizations has not been acknowledged in much of the research on transmission and reception history of Jewish sacred

[94] Schorch 2014, 139. It is worth recognizing how boldly Schorch uses both the word 'Biblical' and the term "Rewritten Bible (genre)". Especially when compared to White Crawford, who proclaimed the deconstruction of the demarcation line between "biblical" and "nonbiblical" as her main interest, this total lack of explicit questioning of these expressions' relevance cannot but strike the reader. It seems that Schorch assumes Rewritten Bible as a genre includes certain texts that reflect the reception of early traditions in transmitting narrations to be later included in Judaism's biblical canons. As we will see, Schorch's view of these texts as having a merely functional role, as literary loci where different reading traditions might meet and merge, shed light on the emergence of these early traditions.

[95] Schorch 2014, 150.

Scripture, as Schorch sees it. To make his case, he examines examples in the Book of Jubilees,[96] which at one place seem to follow the Masoretic, at another the Samaritan, and occasionally even both vocalization traditions of Pentateuchal material. To sum up Schorch's main thought, he seems to treat the "Rewritten Bible (genre)" as a group of certain kinds of texts that *in their literary form embody emergences of alternative vocalization traditions* in late Second Temple Judaism. The genre thus, *reflecting how biblical texts were read*, qualifies as a functional tool in the search of these emergences. As these *emergences of reading traditions*, in turn, are at the same time *emergences for different re-writings*, Schorch quite legitimately recognizes their relevance for the understanding of the origins of what he calls the "Rewritten Bible genre."

Interesting for the purpose of this thesis is the complex interplay between the emergences of literal and oral traditions in which the reader of the text partakes as an active or passive transmitter and recipient. The focus on the *reader* and on vocalization as an intimate constitutive of the *reading* of the texts is apparent already in the opening of Schorch's article. Referring to the reception of Exod 2:5 in early Judaism, Schorch highlights the "fact that two different stories emerged from alternative vocalizations of one and the same word with an identical consonantal."[97] He thereafter concludes that "[v]ocalization and reading are of outmost importance for *the creation of the text in the mind of its reader* and for the transmission of the text and its reception."[98] The popular idea of the reader (or other recipient) as (co-)creator in hermeneutics attains new depths in the face of a consonantal script as Hebrew, where the very act of reading is unthinkable and the story in some cases non-existent without the reader contributing to the text with vowels. The same focus on the creation of the text by its reader is further attested when Schorch elaborates his criticism against the inequal treatment of consonantal texts and its vocalizations in Rewritten Bible research:

> It is not sufficient to describe these "re-written" texts simply as products of scribal activity in the narrower sense of the word;[99] they should in fact be viewed as products of a certain way of reading their *Vorlage* as well. After all, to some extent at least, it is the reader who creates the text.[100]

[96] One of the few unquestioned Rewritten Bible representatives.
[97] Schorch 2014, 138.
[98] Schorch 2014, 138. My emphasis.
[99] As, *e.g.*, White Crawford seems to do.
[100] Schorch 2014, 139.

Again, the clear focus on the reader and the processes of reading are manifest in this passage. At this point occurs also the abovementioned emergence of the Rewritten Bible genre as the locus of new traditions, or "way[s] of reading," as Schorch puts it. This notion is in the core of how Schorch visions the mutual benefit of the study of vocalizations on one hand and that of Rewritten Bible on the other. Regarding the former he maintains that "the texts of the rewritten Bible genre" can, "[i]nsofar …[they] reflect the ways in which their respective *Vorlage* were read,"[101] prove helpful in understanding how certain fixed reading traditions were developed in early Judaism. Better understanding of these "ways, in which the Biblical text was read during the Late Second Temple period,"[102] could then in turn contribute to a better understanding of "the emergence of the texts of the Rewritten Bible genre."[103] As mentioned above, this *emergence* seems, indeed, to be the key for understanding Schorch's perspective as he apparently sees that the two strains of research junction there. In matter of fact, the *emergence of the different traditions* is identical both to the *emergence of differently vocalized readings* and to the *emergence of the Rewritten Bible genre*, the former being the premise (or the phenomenon pure itself), the latter the ultimate result (or proof). That is how reading becomes a decisive factor in the transmission process of biblical texts. That is also the point, however, where questions about the exact relationship of traditions both to the individual reader and to Rewritten Bible texts rise.

This aspect does not go unrecognized in Schorch's article, even though in-depth commenting on the issue wins no greater space in the discussion. Closing a comparison between two opposite readings of a biblical passage, based on possible minor confusions of either graphically or phonetically (often) interchangeable consonants, or simply on different vocalizations of the same consonantal, Schorch concludes that

> it is obvious that a reader from the late Second Temple period could have read the text found in the (proto-)Masoretic text, or the text found in the Samaritan version on the basis of the same consonantal framework. At that time, the two were almost graphically identical. Thus, it was left to the reader to decide whether he read a text praising Simeon and Levi, or rather one which cursed the two brothers. His decision would probably have been led by

[101] Schorch 2014, 139.
[102] Schorch 2014, 139.
[103] Schorch 2014, 139.

> tradition: Either he knew the vocalization of the consonantal framework by heart, or he could at least paraphrase the story.[104]

The almost innocently careless notion of Schorch that the tradition the individual reader had learned decided his reading of the consonantal text demonstrates well the depth and complex dynamics of the interdependence of the two. Nowhere in his article, though, does Schorch give a more thorough description or analysis on the theme—for him, it would probably demand more comprehensive research on the emergences of the different vocalization tradition, not yet carried out. The issue remains as we now turn to Brooke and his proposal of integrating memory research into the research of the Rewritten Bible.

Remembering

Brooke, too, views the re-*writer* of traditions essentially as their *reader* when he explores how the sociological concept of memory, both individual and cultural, could help understand Rewritten Scripture. Closely related to memory in sociological perspective, the concept of identity comes to play a prominent role also in Brooke's argument as he maintains that the role of the dynamics of creating and reflecting individual and collective identities in rewriting authoritative texts should not be underestimated. Parallel to Schorch, Brooke claims that the perspective he wants to introduce to the Rewritten Scripture discussion has been mostly neglected in biblical scholarship to date. However, instead of playing down the more active role of a writer, as Schorch does, Brooke paints a scene where the individual act of writing actively participates in the interplay of collective reading processes, forming and being formed by these. His noticeable emphasis on the sociological context of rewriting renders his view strikingly similar to that of Laato, as will be seen below.

Starting with individual memory, Brooke emphasizes the fact that rewriting always succeeds through the action of an individual scribe, with his individual motives involved. In spite of the problems related to the study of individual memory,[105] Brooke wishes to show that "it is possible to adopt a pragmatic approach and talk of the individual person's role in the transmission of tradition, to attempt to describe something of such a person's mental activities

[104] Schorch 2014, 143.
[105] Brooke (2014, 121) makes a short notion thereof but does not elaborate the issue further.

and mind's retention, some of which is textual."[106] In other words: some of an individual mind's functions of remembering and taking part in a tradition are evidenced in the textual form they take in a text in the production of which it is involved. Important components in this process are the particular individual's memory, his individual motives and the complex practices through which the reproduction of memories and texts takes place.

It seems there is little to be said of the individual mind involved in the transmission process; Brooke's message, in short, is that the functions and ways of remembering of an individual mind as part of the process should not be forgotten. The motives behind the individual mind's interventions in the transmission process, however, appear interesting—not least when compared with the Rewritten Bible concept of Laato that will be dealt with further below. In addition to a desire for clarification and exegesis, Brooke maintains that

> [a]mongst other factors the contemporary life setting of the author of Rewritten Scripture influences the combination of ideas that create the *tendenz* of the adjustments to the underlying tradition; an earlier text is re-presented, that is, made present again, through individual authors reflecting their own contexts of discourse and attempting to meet the needs of their audiences as they perceive them or desire to mould them.[107]

Rewriting appears in this passage as "re-presentation" of earlier realities resulting from a rereading of them in a new situation. Further, these "re-presentations" are always ideological, as Brooke adds, creating "a way of looking at the world"[108] and attempting to manipulate an audience to adopt it. Here the goals of the scribes to explain the authoritative text are essentially merged with and influenced by their life situation with all its private, political, and cultural aspects. Precisely by virtue of reflecting the individual identity confronted and formed by those aspects the resulting composition reflects relevant aspects for the contemporary cohabitants as well. The third aspect of individual memory taken up by Brooke and described as "a complex network of practices through which the reproduction or re-presentation of texts takes place"[109] is no less illuminating. Through this aspect Brooke wants to emphasize the place of orality in memorization and transmission processes, and the toleration of textual variety, even contradictions, evidenced in the manuscripts of this "pre-canonical" period. What he more

[106] Brooke 2014, 121.
[107] Brooke 2014, 122.
[108] Brooke 2014, 122.
[109] Brooke 2014, 123.

precisely has in mind is the relationship between wider tendencies of what is remembered (or not remembered) in general, and the vocalizations so dear for Schorch above as a specific form of transmitting that combines oral and textual traditions.

Noting that individual memory cannot be understood apart from the cultural memory that constructs it, Brooke argues for the relevance of the latter for Rewritten Scripture research. He approaches the question by quoting four different effects of cultural memory on perceiving the past from Philip Davies[110]—embellishment, distortion, invention, and forgetting—and rephrasing these as strategies of rewriting using the German sociologist Jan Assmann's[111] list of four characteristic principles of cultural memory—institutionalization, obligation, organization, and reconstruction. Thus, Brooke first shows how embellishments in reworked Scripture can in his view exemplify a process of institutionalizing through presenting the inherited tradition in a more coherent form, in this way being "not just for literary effect but usually …[suggesting] other facets of the authoritative inheritance which are being made present to distinguish one group from another."[112] This way the occurring embellishments have in fact an actualizing and identity building function, which leads Brooke to conclude that Rewritten Scripture "crystallizes in a particular way at a particular time for a particular group what the tradition is understood [as] having sought to communicate."[113]

The second match Brooke makes is that of distortion (Davies) and obligation. Assmann's principle of obligation, as we find in Brooke, has to do with value systems and normative identities of groups. These kind of value systems are, according to Brooke, most obviously detected when "Rewritten Scripture 'distorts' its base text,"[114] that is, *e.g.*, imposes a particular system of measuring time in periods of years to demonstrate how this time frame also was lived out by the ancestors before this measuring became legislated. As to Brooke's third match, the technique of invention (Davies) and the principle of organization (Assmann), it might not be quite as obvious what the pair of concepts has in common. However, Brooke explains the invention as an addition in the text that cannot easily be explained by direct textual ambiguities on the one hand, and Assmann's "organization" as "the institutional buttressing of

---

[110] Davies. 2010. "What History Can We Get from the Scrolls, and How?" In: *Hempel, The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Contexts.* STDJ 90. Leiden: Brill.
[111] Assmann 1995. "Collective Memory and Cultural Identity." *New German Critique* 65. pp. 125-133.
[112] Brooke 2014, 129.
[113] Brooke 2014, 129.
[114] Brooke 2014, 129.

communication"[115] on the other. This is then motivated stating that "[o]ne of the principal ways in which such buttressing support takes shape is through explanation and exegesis, through commentary which in this case is implicit in the narrative reworking (as is usual in Rewritten Scripture)." The inventions that are meant here are expansions of the text with new content—that is, one not to be found in any traditions related to the transmission process—that are added to harmonize the text for ideological purposes, to make it, so to speak, more credible for those inside the group.

The fourth and last pair of Brooke's constitutes in forgetting (Davies) and (the capacity of) reconstruction (Assmann). He argues that selective forgetting is "the most notable and obvious means through which memory reconstructs the past."[116] With reference to Assmann, Brooke holds:

> Cultural memory works by selected reconstruction of the past into some kind of unified or focalised pattern to which each contemporary situation relates in its own way, sometimes "by appropriation, sometimes by criticism, sometimes by preservation or by transformation."[117] Rewritten Scripture as the artefactual textual evidence of particular groups at particular times discloses how such groups had a rich capacity for reconstructing the past.[118]

When Brooke later conversely mentions that "[i]t is commonly noted amongst those who have paid attention to the workings of cultural memory that groups, communities, peoples and nations have systems of reflexivity through which all that is remembered is appropriated,"[119] it seems relatively straightforward to state that, in Brooke's view, forgetting and remembering constitute a dynamical pair that defines for a particular group at a particular time what is worth remembering of the past—that is, *what the past is*. Both these aspects are then further reflected in the Rewritten Scripture produced by this particular group.

---

[115] Assmann 1995. "Collective Memory and Cultural Identity." *New German Critique* 65. p. 131; cited in Brooke 2014, 130.
[116] Brooke 2014, 130.
[117] Assmann 1995. "Collective Memory and Cultural Identity." *New German Critique* 65. p. 130; cited in Brooke 2014, 131.
[118] Brooke 2014, 131.
[119] Brooke 2014, 131.

The aspect of selective forgetting contrasts strikingly with Hauerwas's concept of remembering. If for Hauerwas it was essential for the Christian community not to forget those parts of the canon and the history of the church that appear uncomfortable, Brooke's analysis of the functions of collective memory seem to ground in precisely the kind of processes that at least allow for such an activity. I would say, however, that the main difference here depends on the normative and descriptive point of departure respectively. The mechanisms steering the memory of a community and thus their past and their present that Brooke describes undoubtedly take place in the life of Hauerwas's community, too. It is rather the lacking perspective of the normative function of a fixed biblical canon in correcting new interpretations that renders Brooke's description neutral towards the processes of reconstruction. For Hauerwas, remembering what one wants to forget as an identity marker for a faithful people is so important precisely to allow the selective memory of the community to avoid the temptations of self-justification and self-indulgence. And after all, it is not so seldom that God's people according to Hauerwas lives and acts unfaithfully towards the witness they should bear to God's story.

Reality

As we saw, Brooke aims at showing how Rewritten Scripture as textual evidence reflects the complex relationship between cultural and individual memory of a particular group at a particular time and place and its members respectively. In this ideologically contoured and identity-related frame it is, in his view, possible to consider and explain changes in a base text resulting from actions of remembering, re-presenting, and selectively forgetting of individual scribes who themselves, through these very same actions, reflect the memorialization processes of their social and cultural context. A very similar emphasis on rewritings as an integrative part of the changing social contexts of individual scribes can be detected in the processes Laato understands as involved in "Rewritten Bible." Earlier discussions in this thesis have shown how Laato takes Vermes's term in its original context as the hermeneutical key to develop an understanding of the concept as a literary process of creating a referential world for an authoritative text in a new historical and social situation. Such an understanding, in turn, both allows for a wide range of texts with different interpretative methods to be included in the scope of Rewritten Bible and focuses on the process of rereading as an act of harmonizing the religious reality of the readers.

Laying his emphasis on this process of rereading as the fundamental mechanism manifesting itself in rewritings and exegetical ambitions, Laato develops his concept further. The fact that, rather than being able to reconstruct one normative interpretation of biblical texts, “we have many different interpretations depending on how the text is related to certain historical and social conditions,” leads him to conclude that

> [w]hen attention is focused on how biblical texts were involved in continual reading processes in antiquity the modern concept “Rewritten Bible” becomes relevant. The words of the text were understood as imitating a referential world compatible with the reader’s own spiritual reality. When the text was seen as reflecting that reality then all interpretive actions aimed at imitation. However, the texts also left open many questions which interpreters were forced to complete in some way. Therefore, the rewriting of some parts by adding, completing and imitating became important in all textual writings and interpretations.[120]

It is thus the referential world behind the literary interpretive actions that provides Rewritten Bible with its relevance—indeed, according to Laato, this referential world itself *is* Rewritten Bible. This conclusion he then means to derive from Vermes himself: with reference to Fraade[121] who holds that a text can be analytically “transformed” into a Rewritten Bible by stripping it of explicitly exegetical commentaries, Laato states that “[i]t is exactly this process of transformation which is important for Vermes’ meta-level term ‘Rewritten Bible.’”[122] By the transformation process in question he thus refers to an analytical strategy by which the Rewritten Bible as a referential world, filling up and harmonizing the biblical text with the life conditions of the reader, can be detected behind the different literary and formal choices to give this world an expression. Understood in this way, Laato can maintain that “[t]he definition of Rewritten Bible can be worked so as to concern different interpretive activities,”[123] since the term Rewritten Bible itself cannot be considered identical with these activities, but these, rather, represent an expression of it.

This understanding of the concept “Rewritten Bible” is crystallized even more clearly in Laato’s final conclusions of his paper, where he defines the term as

---

[120] Laato 2010, 5.
[121] Fraade. 2006. “Rewritten Bible and Rabbinic Midrash as Commentary.” In: Bakhos (ed.). *Current Trends in the Study of Midrash.* SupJSJ 106. Leiden: Brill; cited in Laato 2010, 6.
[122] Laato 2010, 6.
[123] Laato 2010, 6.

> a literary phenomenon where the reader creates a referential world for the object of his reading by filling its gaps. He arranges the content of the text in its referential world and creates a planned, logical series of events which have a beginning, a middle, and an end. … Such reading processes led in antiquity to new texts where a reader reveals his creation of a referential world for the biblical text.[124]

Thus, "Rewritten Bible" is a phenomenon prior to the concrete rewriting; the rewritings, in whatever literary form, reflect—indeed: betray—the referential world created by the author/scribe as a reader in his attempt to make sense of the texts before him. The scholarly relevance of the term is to be found exactly in this the concept's pointing outside of itself, to the role of authoritative texts for their readers and the subsequent processes of actualizing them in new historical and social situations, as Laato himself describes:

> The "Rewritten Bible" is not a form historical concept but a modern term which emphasizes the reading process in ancient texts. It opens up a new horizon for a modern critical scholar to understand that a reader in antiquity attempted to build up his religious referential world with the aid of the biblical text. […] "Rewritten Bible" enables us to see dynamics between the authoritative texts and the social community interpreting them. New social conditions led to the need for new information from authoritative texts […] containing secrets or hidden principles which could be discovered through careful reading and the combination of different texts in the Bible and the application of heuristic interpretive tendencies. In this way old scriptures which were seen to reflect reality could speak in a new way to a new audience.[125]

Laato thus argues for the proper role of "Rewritten Bible" concept being a key in decoding the dynamics of interpreting authoritative texts in changing social conditions. In so doing, he consciously loosens the concept from every claim to describe the physical texts themselves and holds that it is, indeed, best understood as "a wide analytical concept, an umbrella term which includes processes where old authoritative texts are reinterpreted and actualized with necessary modifications in new texts."[126] In this description, certain even notable parallels to Hauerwas's concept cannot escape notice, and it is my task in the following section to elaborate them further with all other insights from the discussions above.

[124] Laato 2010, 26.
[125] Laato 2010, 26.
[126] Laato 2010, 26.

2.4 Discussion

In this chapter, I have presented the theoretical framework of this study in Stanley Hauerwas's narrative ethics and discussed Rewritten Bible research in its light to identify intersecting aspects. What I found was that Hauerwas's normative concept of telling God's tale in a faithful community's life through remembering and embodying can very well be likened to the idea of Rewritten Bible despite the different perspectives of a historical study of Jewish antiquity and a normative Christian ethics. In fact, both the recurring themes of authority, memory, interpretation, living tradition, and the life and identity of the interpreting community on the one hand, and the way of seeing the authoritative Scripture as something flexible and self-interpretative on the other, suggest a closeness that may surprise at first sight. Even though some essential differences cannot be overseen, these constitute no actual obstacle for using the concept of Rewritten Bible as a hermeneutical tool to understand the Christian story of God in the lives of the devout as Hauerwas describes it.

Especially in the approaches of those defining the Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture as an exegetical process we saw a tendency to loosen the concept from the specific Second Temple Jewish context to preserve its heuristic value. The aspect of identity-constructing authority was already recognized as the main constitutive factor in the scholarly discourse on the Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture and was detected to underlie even the persuasiveness of the approaches in question. This "unrooting" of the Rewritten Bible concept found its expression in a particular clarity in Petersen who condensed the very meaning of Rewritten Scripture into a designation for a certain kind of intertextuality applicable in all contexts and characterized by an authoritative relationship between the texts under examination. What was notable was that it was precisely in the aspect of authority that Petersen localized the constitutive value of the Rewritten Bible as a reaction to the resignation due to the growing awareness of the impossibility to reconstruct any plausible borders for a Jewish canon in the Second Temple period. This notion of authority resonates well with the relationship between the Bible and its interpreting community as depicted by Hauerwas and is well transferrable to a Christian context. Combined with the views of Laato and Brooke, who described Rewritten Bible/Scripture as "a referential world" or "a way of looking at the world" respectively, the aspect of authority becomes existentially relevant for the community identifying with their Scripture. This merely stated fact of modified interpretation in changing social and historical

conditions wins normative value in Hauerwas's thought, setting up the locus of the very happening of God's story.

The main feature of incompatibility between the Rewritten Bible concept and Hauerwas's narrative ethics was the contradiction between the different perspectives on a scriptural canon. Whereas Qumran findings had caused practically all assumptions of a clear-cut Second Temple Jewish canon to collapse among the scholarship in that field, Hauerwas held the Christian Biblical canon a normative image of how the truth of God's tale should be embodied. At a closer look, however, this apparent contradiction proved only partially true. Not only does Hauerwas himself acknowledge the essentially self-interpretative and conversational form of the Biblical canon to provide the ideal model for being a people faithful to its book, but he also insists on a contingent, intergenerational community as the prerequisite for the very existence of God's story. This testifies to his recognition of a more complex dynamics of the formation of the Bible than one might at first glance assume. The book of the Bible functions as a corrective tool for the memory of its people—no question! —but without the surplus of the contingent realization of its truth in that people's way of life it is indeed no Bible at all. If one is willing to see rewriting in a broader sense of rereading and embodying, Hauerwas's Bible can even be seen as a normatively determined Rewritten Bible which easily finds parallels among other descriptions of living tradition passed on by faithful scribes through their exegesis on an authoritative text.

In addition to the analogous forms of Scripture in Rewritten Bible discourse and Hauerwas's system, respectively, already the fact that the term Rewritten Bible was originally launched before some of the most sensational finds in Qumran regarding the canon were unearthed renders it in fact more compatible with the reality of Hauerwas's community than that of Second Temple Judaism. It was with a similar kind of canon in mind that Vermes first applied his thereafter (in)famously well received concept and could thus appear much more usable in examining Biblical reception in later Christianity or Judaism where there already is a fixed scriptural canon to start with. Whether under the name of Rewritten Bible/Scripture or not, the insights won in the exegetical scholarship on the phenomenon once called Rewritten Bible should not be neglected in Christian theology. Providing a possible tool for examining narrations of Biblical stories embodied in both text, image, liturgy, and people's lives outside the Biblical text itself, the so-called Rewritten Bible could benefit theological research by

showing ways in which God and his story are revealed and communicated in concrete expressions of faith.

3 A Test Case: Animal Apocalypse

The purpose of this thesis is to investigate Rewritten Bible as a relevant hermeneutical tool for understanding the dynamics of telling God's tale according to Hauerwas. Rewritten Bible as a tool could illuminate the God who is told by people's lived lives in the communities of the devout. With the theoretical framework in Hauerwas's ethics, where narrative takes the form of embodiment rather than verbal expression, the "text" of the big picture cannot be restricted to literary products. Mapping all the possible ways of telling, reading, and embodying the Bible, however, is beyond the scope of this thesis, even though this multiplicity should be kept in mind when analysing Biblical narrations in a Hauerwasian framework. Instead of offering an exhaustive presentation of all the nuances involved in this complex framework, I have chosen to analyse a rewritten Biblical story in the Second Temple Jewish composition *Animal Apocalypse* (*An. Apoc.*) with the help of the methodology of Erkki Koskenniemi and Pekka Lindqvist. First, in chapter 3.1, I shall shortly introduce the context of *An. Apoc.*, to then in 3.2 introduce the used methodology connecting it to its roots in the Rewritten Bible research. The comparative analysis of *An. Apoc.* and a chosen Biblical base text follows in 3.3, and the chapter ends with concluding remarks in 3.4. Before we turn to the real business, however, it should be noted already here that the setting of the analysis is both artificial and drastically simplified. Hopefully these choices only allow the main idea of the project, that is, showing how a Rewritten Bible can be read, to appear even clearer to the reader.

3.1 The Text in Its Context

The topic of this subchapter is to introduce *An. Apoc.* in its historical and literary context. In 3.1.1, I introduce the body of Enochic literature discovered to date and how *An. Apoc.* relates to it. After that in 3.1.2 follows a broad overview over the collection of books as a part of which *An. Apoc.* has been transmitted. Lastly, in 3.1.3, I cast a look into the broader historical context in which *An. Apoc.* was written and the dating of the text.

3.1.1 Placing in the Enochic Body

Enoch is a central figure in Jewish and Christian apocalyptic literature. The Hebrew Bible mentions two men by the name Enoch – Enoch, son of Cain, father of Irad (Gen. 4:17f) and Enoch son of Jared, father of Methuselah (Gen. 5:18-24; 1 Chron. 1:3) — both shortly referenced within family lists inheriting from Adam. The latter of the two Enochs, of whom is accounted that he "walked with God; then he was no more for God took him" (Gen. 5:23), is the figure in question. Already this cryptic statement indicates that there is possibly a broader narrative of Enoch in the background, which undoubtedly has contributed to the myriad of later legends, fantastic interpretations, and controversy both in Jewish and Christian reception. In addition to his epithet as righteous, his roles as sage, seer, and scribe have become especially important.[127]

Among the wide span of literature from 5th century B.C.E. to Late Antiquity that relates to the figure of Enoch — having its latest contributions in the beginning of the Modern Age — three texts can be considered as the main narrations of that figure: Ethiopic Book of Enoch (1 Enoch); Slavonic Book of Enoch (2 Enoch), passed down to us in a longer (A) and a shorter (B) version; and Hebrew Book of Enoch (3 Enoch). Each of these three texts includes mainly accounts of apocalyptic visions, where the history of Israel is presented from the beginnings, to the author's present, and the end of days.[128] The oldest traditions of Enoch preserved to our present day can be identified in 1 Enoch, which not only includes the Animal Apocalypse, the main research item of this thesis, but also constitutes a part of the Ethiopic biblical canon to date.[129]

3.1.2 The Ethiopic Book of Enoch

As already indicated, 1 Enoch, although most likely of Jewish origin, has had a prominent place in the early Christian tradition and become a part of the biblical canon of the Ethiopian Church to date. The complete version of the text is preserved to us only in 5th to 6th-century ancient

[127] Sarna 2007, 441; Nickelsburg 2001, 71.
[128] Sacchi 1986, 42. For 2 Enoch, see Nickelsburg 2001, 79-81; Sacchi 1986, 47-50. For 3 Enoch, see Nickelsburg 2001, 81; Sacchi 1986, 50-51. For an overview over the figure of Enoch in early Jewish and Christian writing, see Nickelsburg 2001, 71-100.
[129] For 1 Enoch in the Ethiopian tradition, see Nickelsburg 2001, 104-8.

Ethiopic (Ge'ez) translation from Greek, of which there are 49 pre-19th-century manuscripts known, the few earliest from the 15th to 16th century CE. In addition, some Aramaic fragments have been found in Qumran, and sporadic Greek, Latin, Coptic, and Syriac fragments are known. Due to this, the most common view among scholars is that the original account was written in Aramaic, then translated into Greek and eventually also into Ge'ez, in which it was preserved having established its authoritative position in the Coptic Church. Some scholars argue, though, that some parts of the text that include the older narratives might have been originally written in Hebrew.[130]

The text of 1 Enoch is constituted of five parts, individual texts which can further be divided in smaller sections.[131] A rough overview is provided in the following.

After an introduction in chapters 1-5 follows the *Book of Watchers* that consists of two parts: chapters 6-11 and 12-36 respectively. The completion of the composition is likely to have occurred by the mid-3rd century B.C.E. Central themes in the *Book of Watchers* include the narration of the fall of angels, as well as the origin of evil and chaos in the world, before concluding with an apocalyptic vision of the coming world at the end of days.[132] From the Aramaic fragments, we also know about a *Book of Giants* that possibly was an extension of the *Book of Watchers*, but was erased in the reception process. The *Book of Giants* tells the story of giants having dream visions of their coming destruction and consulting Enoch about the matter. Although an accurate dating of the *Book of Giants* is more problematic than that of the *Book of Watchers*, since it seems to be influenced by chapters 6-16 of the *Book of Watchers* a plausible terminus a quo can be determined to the late 3rd century B.C.E.[133]

The second part that follows in chapters 37-71, the so-called *Book of Parables*, describes a way to salvation in esoteric messianic terms. The book is also, through its reception in the thought of Christianity, crucial for understanding Christian messianic expectations. What specifies this book is that the revelation about the coming judgement is written in a form of a chain of

[130] Nickelsburg 2001, 9-16; Sacchi 1986, 44. Milik (1976, 5) argues for a slightly different composition of books in the Aramaic version, according to the fragments found in Qumran: the Book of Parables seems to be absent among the fragments, whereas several are identified with the Book of Giants.
[131] Grintz 2007, 443; Nickelsburg 2001, 7.
[132] Grintz 2007, 443; Nickelsburg 2001, 7, 8, 172-173; Sacchi 1986, 44-45.
[133] Stuckenbruck 2014, 17-21.

heavenly tableaux. The *Book of Parables* also appears to be the latest component of 1 Enoch, dating probably to the late 1st century B.C.E.[134]

The following *Book of (Courses of) the (Heavenly) Luminaries* (or *Astronomical Book*[135]) of chapters 72-82 is distinct from the rest of 1 Enoch in its character, providing a description of the course of the 364-day year. In the light of the Aramaic fragments, this account seems to be a summary of a longer text that, after the development of Greek astronomy, does not appear to have won greater interest among its contemporaries. The *Book of Luminaries* probably gives expression to the oldest traditions in 1 Enoch that stem from the Persian period.[136]

After the astronomical account, the *Book of Dream Visions* moves the genre back to traditional apocalypse, constituting the fourth part of 1 Enoch in chapters 83-90. This part can also be divided in two, according to the accounts of two visions that are described in 83-4 and 85-90, the latter of which being the so-called *Animal Apocalypse* (*An. Apoc.*). Both visions retell symbolically the history of Israel until the Hasmonean period[137] and extend to an apocalyptic vision in the end, with the *Book of Dream Visions* backing up Enoch's authority to strengthen the account of the vision presented in *An. Apoc*.[138]

The last chapters 91-108 of 1 Enoch, the so-called *Apocalypse of Weeks*, also referred to as the *Epistle of Enoch*, tells the story of Enoch reading the history of Israel divided into ten periods of time called weeks – hence the name. It dates to the 2nd century B.C.E. and takes the form of an exhortation for the righteous to persevere while waiting for the promised judgement. The book also includes the *Book of Noah* in chapters 106-7, that describes the birth of Noah, before concluding with Enoch's "last words" to mankind in chapter 108.[139]

---

[134] Grintz 2007, 443; Nickelsburg 2001, 7; Sacchi 1986, 46-47.
[135] E.g., Milik 1976.
[136] Grintz 2007, 443; Nickelsburg 2001, 7-8; Sacchi 1986, 45-46.
[137] See 3.1.3 below.
[138] Grintz 2007, 443; Nickelsburg 2001, 8; Sacchi 1986, 46.
[139] Grintz 2007, 443; Nickelsburg 2001, 8; Sacchi 1986, 46.

3.1.3 Historical context and dating of *An. Apoc.*

To understand the following discussions on *An. Apoc.*, it is crucial to have some background knowledge about the historical events at and prior to the suggested date of its composition. As suggested before in this chapter, *An. Apoc.* is agreed to stem from a period in Jewish literary history called Second Temple Period. The historical landmarks for this period were the rebuilding of the Jewish temple in Jerusalem in ca. 515 B.C.E after the Babylonian exile, and its destruction in 70 C.E. by the Romans after two major Jewish uprisings against the governing imperial powers. During the Second Temple period, Judaea experienced many changes of both external rules and those of Judaean origin, beginning with Alexander the Great who subjected the area in 332 B.C.E.[140] The Greek rule was first followed by that of the Ptolemaic kingdom when Ptolemy I of Egypt defeated Alexander's successors in 301 B.C.E.[141] After a century of rivalling claims over the area between Ptolemies and the Seleucid kingdom governing Syria, the latter took over in 200 B.C.E. and Judaea was subjected under the rule of Antiochus III and his descendants.[142] The following periods of Hasmonean revolt[143] and Hasmonean rule[144] led by a Jewish dynasty are the key periods from the point of view of dating *An. Apoc.* and are presented in more detail below. In 63 B.C.E., Judaea became under the governing presence of the Roman empire,[145] which era witnessed both the rule of Herod the Great[146] and the first Jewish war[147] that eventually led to the destruction of the temple and abolition of Jewish statehood.[148]

The period called Hasmonean or Maccabean revolt plays a central role when attempting to date *An. Apoc.* During the rule of Antiochus III's son, Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175-164) who succeeded his brother Seleucus IV, Judaea experienced major oppressions of the Jewish religion to the point of direct persecution and executions of everyone who resisted.[149] The Jewish reaction was rebellious movement that grew to military activity initially led by Mattathias from

[140] Stern 2007, 191.
[141] Stern 2007, 191.
[142] Stern 2007, 191-192.
[143] Stern 2007, 193-194.
[144] Stern 2007, 194-196.
[145] Stern 2007, 196.
[146] Stern 2007, 197-198.
[147] Stern 2007, 199-200.
[148] Stern 2007, 200; Avi-Yonah 2007, 200.
[149] Stern 2007, 193.

a priestly dynasty called Hasmoneans and continued by his son Judas Maccabeus.[150] The revolting troops eventually gained back religious freedom for Jews in 164 B.C.E.[151] However, the new Seleucid king Demetrius I, who ascended the throne in 162 B.C.E., wanted to put an end to the Hasmonean dominance in the Judaean area. Subsequently, Judas continued opting for political independence, allied with the Romans, and had military success against the Seleucids until his victory over the Seleucid commander Nicanor in 161 B.C.E. Shortly after this success, in 160 B.C.E., Judas was eventually defeated by Demetrius and killed in the battle.[152]

The official Hasmonean rule began with Judas's brother Jonathan being appointed high priest by Demetrius's rival Alexander Balas in 152 B.C.E.[153] After Jonathan was murdered by the Syrian commander Tryphon, his brother Simeon continued his work and obtained recognition of the freedom of Judaea and the exemption of taxes from the Seleucid king Demetrius II in 142 B.C.E.[154] Even though the rule of Simeon put an end to Seleucid ambitions in Judaea, the real prosperity of the Hasmoneans began first with Simeon's son John Hyrcanus and the collapse of the Seleucid kingdom in 129 B.C.E. During his and his successors' Aristobulus I (104-103) and Alexander Yannai's (103-76) rule, the geographical dimensions of Judaea expanded remarkably and the Jewish culture was implemented among the annexed population of non-Jewish origin.[155] The Hasmonean period came to its end through the Roman conquest of Jerusalem and the Temple mount in 63 B.C.E. Syria was turned into a Roman province, while Judaea, granted only a limited autonomy, was reduced in area and obligated to pay taxes to the governing power.[156]

The political changes during the Ptolemaic and Seleucid rules also involved turbulence among the local leading bodies of Judaea. Jerusalem was led by a high priest who, in the beginning of Antiochus IV's reign, was Onias III. However, Antiochus soon replaced Onias by the brother of the latter, Jason, who had promised to collect more taxes from the Judaean people.[157] Hellenistic-minded as he was, Jason also turned Jerusalem into a Hellenistic polis with all its

[150] Stern 2007, 193-194.
[151] Stern 2007, 194.
[152] Stern 2007, 194.
[153] Stern 2007, 194.
[154] Stern 2007, 194.
[155] Stern 2007, 195.
[156] Stern 2007, 196.
[157] Stern 2007, 193; Venter 1997, 71.

typical characteristics, including a gymnasium which soon replaced the temple as the center of the social life of the city.[158] Soon, in 171 B.C.E., Antiochus also replaced Jason with the even more radically Hellenistic Menelaus, with whose help he plundered the Jerusalem temple in 169 B.C.E.[159] During Antiochus' last campaign to Egypt in 168 B.C.E., Jason shortly returned to power upon rumors of the death of the king. His reign soon ended, however, when Antiochus, defeated by the Romans, returned from Egypt and attacked Jerusalem, killing people and taking them as slaves.[160] It was after these events that the persecutions in form of cultic restrictions and executions were installed, which, however, did not contribute to the intended result, as so many devout Jews, especially from the Chassidic movement, were ready to go to martyrdom instead of compromising their belief.[161]

Among the Jewish population of Judaea, there were different reactions to these political occurrences. I have already mentioned the Chassidic movement that represented a radical pietistic movement opposing the Seleucid rule. In addition to that, Venter argues for two opposed groups, the Oniads and Tobiads, among the ruling elite of Judaea.[162] Oniads are characterised by Venter as pro-Ptolemaic and conservative, as well as having a theocratic ideal of Israel.[163] As the name suggests, they were supporters of the original priestly line of Onias and opposed the rule of Jason and Menelaus. Tobiads, in turn, were according to Venter politically reformist and pro-Seleucid and supported Jason whom they adopted as their leader.[164] The name of the party refers to an influential lay family from Gilead, who are known already from the 3rd century B.C.E. onwards.[165]

Dating of *An. Apoc.* is often done by identifying historical events and persons behind the allegory, typically culminating on the figure of the ram with a great horn of 1 Enoch 90:9-19 Most scholars identify this figure with Judas Maccabeus.[166] The battles described in 1 Enoch 90:19 can therefore be understood as his military successes. Subsequently, the most popular dating is sometime before his defeat by Demetrius in 160 B.C.E., since as Olson suggests,

[158] Stern 2007, 193; Venter 1997, 71.
[159] Stern 2007, 193; Venter 1997, 71-72.
[160] Stern 2007, 193; Venter 1997, 72.
[161] Stern 2007, 193; Venter 1997, 72.
[162] Venter 1997, 71.
[163] Venter 1997, 71.
[164] Venter 1997, 71.
[165] Stern 2007, 192.
[166] For an overview, see Ego 2005, 177-178, note 2; Olson 2013, 85-86, note 2.

nothing in the account indicates a knowledge of this defeat or the death of Judas.[167] Rather, it could be an account of either a exhortation towards, or celebration of, the victorious battle against Nicanor.[168] However, Laato has a different approach and argues for the possibility of a later dating based on his understanding of the apocalyptic chronology of *An. Apoc.*, maintaining that a 2nd-century date of composition of the final version post the Maccabean revolts cannot be entirely excluded.[169] For the argument of this thesis, finding an accurate dating is less important than its hypothetical character, which is why I do not attempt to offer a reconstruction in preference of any of these views.

3.2 Rewritten Bible Methodology

Having introduced the text of *An. Apoc.* in its context, I now turn to the methodology explored in this thesis. In 3.2.1, I return to questions of what can be thought to count as Rewritten Bible. In 3.2.2, I then proceed to present Koskenniemi & Lindqvist's suggestion for a methodology to analyse Rewritten bible texts, of which methodology I make use of in my reflections later in the thesis.

3.2.1 What Counts as Rewritten Bible?

As indicated in the above discussion in chapter 2, the criteria of what counts as Rewritten Bible—were there to be such a term of heuristic value—are far from clear. On top of that, the stance taken in this thesis takes a relatively free departure from the traditional ways of viewing the issue. Nevertheless, it is useful to cast a look at some formal criteria developed from the classical Rewritten Bible discourse, before turning to methodological reflection for the analysis of our test case. Particularly useful for this thesis are Eugene Ulrich's and Erkki Koskenniemi & Pekka Lindqvist's differing lists of characteristics that distinguish Rewritten Bible from

[167] Olson 2013, 85. Olson himself (2013, 5) supports an original dating in 165 B.C.E. which was then revised in mid-161 B.C.E. following the victorious battle against Nicanor in Asada.
[168] Olson 2013, 86; Venter 2004, 721.
[169] Laato 2016, 19.

biblical editions. As we saw above in 2.3.1, Ulrich examines the scribal activity of the Antiquity by distinguishing between Scripture and literature—a distinction he finds manifested in a temporal line from Pre-Scripture through Scripture to Rewritten Scripture.[170] After defining the texts belonging to the category of Scripture, he then identifies changes occurring in these texts, resulting in revised editions rather than rewritten compositions. As a result, he concludes a list of features characteristic for the kinds of rewriting that were considered legitimate inside the boundaries of sacred Scripture:

1. revising chronological problems to avoid inconsistencies …
2. realigning the order of the execution of commands to agree with that of the original command …
3. supplementing one narrative with additional details from another book …
4. rearranging the sequence of an event to support the claim for a sacred site …
5. inserting a prophetic appearance to reiterate the book's theology and strengthen its prophetic claim …
6. inserting an alternate form of the story for completeness …
7. chronological and various other revisions …
8. occasionally inserting verses of additional prophetic material …
9. frequent expansions of phrases, insertions of verses, plus major rearrangements …
10. rearranging the sequence of one chapter due to eschatological views …
11. adding more Psalms; emphasizing Davidic authorship and divine inspiration …
12. inserting repeated examples of narrative embellishment to enhance the story …
13. inserting additional stories to a growing cycle …[171]

Subsequently, Ulrich holds that "[a]ll these features maintain, even while expanding, the spirit of the book being revised; they do not cross the border and become a different composition."[172] These features allowed in the transmission process without changing a text's identity from a biblical edition to a new composition are then contrasted with a list of characteristic features of "Rewritten Scripture." The latter can, according to Ulrich, be detected in what he calls "Rewritten Pre-Scripture," that is, traces of earlier (non-scriptural) traditions preserved in the biblical books. Through his analysis of pre-scriptural elements in the transmission of relevant books[173], he arrives at a list including the following markers: *large-scale expansions, new*

[170] Ulrich 2014, 100-101.
[171] Ulrich 2014, 92-93.
[172] Ulrich 2014, 93.
[173] For a list, see 2.3.1 above.

speaker, new claim to divine revelation, new scope, new arrangement or new structure, new theological agenda.[174]

An alternative approach to the question of boundaries and criteria for Rewritten Bible is found in Koskenniemi & Lindqvist's development of concrete methodological steps for analysing the reception of now canonical biblical texts. The two are associated with the same SRB-network[175] as Laato and understand their concept of Rewritten Bible accordingly:

> In our opinion, the biblical tradition was reworked in many different genres, although each of them rewrote the Bible. Thus as it is used today "rewritten Bible [sic!] is not a literary genre. Instead, the term should be used, as suggested, for example, by Harrington,[176] only as a very wide umbrella to cover different documents (or parts of them) reflecting the afterlife of the Old Testament material, and other, more appropriate, terms should be used to denote specific types of the written tradition.[177]

In the place of the criteria listed by P.S. Alexander,[178] which still is, according to them, the best attempt to date to organize Rewritten Bible in generic terms, Koskenniemi & Lindqvist themselves suggest including "at least the following [under their general umbrella of OT afterlife]:

1) Works, in which large parts of the Old Testament are retold, such as Josephus' *Antiquities* of Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*.
2) Single stories, which were retold later, such as, for example, the story of Daniel and Nebuchadnezzar (Daniel 4) in *The Life of Daniel*.
3) Reworked Psalms, such as Psalms 91 in 11Q11.
4) Legal texts, in which a single commandment of the Torah is rendered in the later tradition, such as typically found in Philo's texts, or as the entire Mosaic Law is summarized, as, for example, in Josephus.

---

[174] Ulrich 2014, 99-100.
[175] See note 3 in 1.3.2.
[176] Harrington, "Palestinian Adaptations of Biblical Narratives and Prophecies. I. The Bible Rewritten". In Kraft & Nickelsburg (eds.), *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreter* (Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1986).
[177] Koskenniemi & Lindqvist 2008, 16.
[178] Alexander, "Retelling the Old Testament" in: Carson & Williamson (eds.), *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1988) cited in: Koskenniemi & Lindqvist 2008, 13-14. For Koskenniemi & Lindqvist, even this listing is, however, not plausible enough to make a classification in terms of genre meaningful, as they conclude that "[t]he only reasonable solution seems to abandon the use of the term 'rewritten Bible' as a definition of a genre." (Koskenniemi & Lindqvist 2008, 15).

5) Re-used Old Testament prophecies, either in larger units or smaller fragments, such as in the use of Ezekiel in later writings.
6) Translations, which may follow the content of the text accurately, as the LXX mostly does, or which clearly reveal the history of the interpretation of the biblical texts, such as the targumim generally do."[179]

Koskenniemi & Lindqvist accompany this list with several notions about distinction, with those of most relevance including the already familiar distinction between *editions of the biblical text* and the *rewritten Bible*, as well as a new one between *rewritten Bible* and *midrash*. In the first question concerning distinction, Koskenniemi & Lindqvist take no explicit position. Considering the latter, however, they recommend reserving the word *midrash* for Jewish/Rabbinic exegesis and using the related term *haggadic* with caution, whereas *rewritten Bible* should denote compositions of a continuous text. In contrast to these distinctions, some others, equally circulating in the Rewritten Bible discourse, appear for Koskenniemi & Lindqvist merely artificial. One of such cases is the already discussed distinction between rewritings that *consider their base text sacred and those that do not*. Koskenniemi & Lindqvist's main concern at this point is the polemical reception of biblical stories and themes in, for example, ancient Greek writing that they want to include as a legitimate form of rewriting (and rereading) biblical stories. However, a such view also opens new possibilities, which prove especially relevant for the most recent reception of biblical narratives, as shown below. A similar tendency to broadening the scale is even manifested in the two remaining distinctions that Koskenniemi & Lindqvist explicitly question: that between *Old Testament and New Testament* texts as a valid Rewritten Bible base text, and the *exclusion of certain corpora* (*e.g.*, rabbinic literature) from the scope of Rewritten Bible research.[180]

As already indicated, the reflections on rewriting Biblical stories in this thesis resonates with Koskenniemi & Lindqvist's generously flexible interpretation of the concept of Rewritten Bible. As they suggest, this umbrella concept should not only be restricted to ancient Jewish writings but include later Christian and Islamic literature and non-literary art forms into our present day. The richness of the possible sources for rewritten Biblical narratives ranges, in Koskenniemi & Lindqvist's view, from *both Old and New Testament* to other *early Jewish, rabbinic and Christian texts*, later *Christian literature* or *Islamic tradition*, and lastly to such

[179] Koskenniemi & Lindqvist 2008, 16. Cf. Laato 2010.
[180] Koskenniemi & Lindqvist 2008, 17-20.

non-literary material *as visual arts, music, or modern films.* Another feature that renders Koskenniemi & Lindqvist's methodology accessible for the purposes of this thesis is their focus on texts of specifically narrative character. By narrowing down their material to rewritten biblical stories in their article, Koskenniemi & Lindqvist logically mention those *texts, where an entire story is rewritten* (without doing any claims of the rewritten compositions needing to be restricted to this story, however!) as their main source. In addition to whole rewritten narratives, Koskenniemi & Lindqvist hold that also *extra-biblical passages*—such as found, e.g., in vitae of Biblical characters—and *fragmentary mentions* should not be disregarded, since they may provide with vital information about the ancient *rereading* of the texts, for example indicating a certain exegetical motif.[181] Because of this creative space that Koskenniemi & Lindqvist's concept of Rewritten Bible leaves as to what can be considered such, I hold their methodology to be suitable for my purposes in this thesis. Accordingly, I will now turn to presenting this methodology more closely.

3.2.2 How to Read Rewritten Bible?

After defining the area of application, Koskenniemi & Lindqvist proceed to develop their recommended methodology for analyzing Rewritten Bible, consisting of two steps: first, *how the original text is changed*, and second, *why it is changed*.[182] As for the first step, Koskenniemi & Lindqvist give three different types of changes: omissions, additions, and other changes (such as rearrangements, substitutions etc.).[183] What should be kept in mind regarding this first step, according to Koskenniemi & Lindqvist, are:

1) Regarding the *text and its original*[184]
    a. The different versions of the Hebrew Text and translations that often could, more or less, diverge from the original and take influence from, e.g., Talmudic and midrashic sources.

[181] Koskenniemi & Lindqvist 2008, 20-23.
[182] Koskenniemi & Lindqvist 2008, 23-39.
[183] Koskenniemi & Lindqvist 2008, 28-30.
[184] Koskenniemi & Lindqvist 2008, 23-30.

   b. The fact that rewritten compositions often combine material from different parts of the original or from different biblical books.
   c. The possibility of lacunae and later, Christian interpolations in the rewritten texts themselves.
2) Regarding *extra-biblical sources*[185]
   a. Jewish sources and traditions were a natural part of the rewriting processes and it is difficult to say when the writer refers to a certain tradition with a concrete source in mind and when the use of tradition is more of an intuitive art.
   b. Graeco-Roman sources are not that much clearer a case than the Jewish ones either, because the Greek influence was already inevitable, and parallels can be of an unconscious imitation of literary forms or themes.

In their second step examining the intention of the writer to the changes, Koskenniemi & Lindqvist list the following aspects to be considered:

1) Regarding the *audience* should be asked[186]
   a. The language
   b. How much the writer expects the audience to know about the story being rewritten
2) Regarding the *intentional versus unintentional* changes[187]
   a. When changes are extensive and/obvious it is more possible to trace back to the intentions of the writer; in case of smaller changes it all becomes more questionable.
   b. An ideological/theological reason versus fluency of the narrative
   c. In small changes the likely relevance of the detail being changed
   d. Some material can be unintentionally added or changed because of a strong line of tradition diverging from the biblical text
   e. If there is "a larger, thematic phenomenon within the literary production of the author"[188]

---

[185] Koskenniemi & Lindqvist 2008, 30-33.
[186] Koskenniemi & Lindqvist 2008, 34.
[187] Koskenniemi & Lindqvist 2008, 35-38.
[188] Koskenniemi & Lindqvist 2008, 37.

f. All in all, "[i]n order to raise the degree of certainty the following are to be considered, firstly, collecting the *cumulative evidence* and determining its uniformity; and secondly, finding possible *analogous cases* by investigating whether a particular lacuna is typical of the author or not. If analogies (i.e. lagunae of the same weight) exist, a supplementary question is whether they can easily be connected with some larger pattern, or whether it is simply the author's way of writing loosely."[189]

3) Regarding the *adaptation* of the original[190]
    a. what and how much the author wishes to be able to have the original say to his generation
    b. *e.g.*, ethical or political adaptations

In both steps, Koskenniemi & Lindqvist emphasise both the risk of speculation and that of taking seemingly obvious connections for granted; for them, it is important to limit the field of possibilities and stay with the facts that can be derived from these possibilities. In systematic theology, however, where any analysis enables us to state something normative about God's reality in our own situation from our own perspective, speculation can transcend the realm of facts. In fact, speculation can, instead, become an important manifestant of truth, if only we remain mindful of directing it correctly. Speculation cannot provide us with *facts* about the narrations in their original situation, but it can trigger our creative thought to find *ways to converse* with the peoples in the past and *to learn* more about ourselves. While I agree with Koskenniemi & Lindqvist that we cannot rather carelessly confuse normative facts and speculation, speculation is a rich form of thought that should not be given up as a resource in a context where doing theology is even a simple possibility.

Speculation aside, in the following I concentrate on what we could call facts when proceeding to showing how the methodology presented here can be applied to a literary product of rewriting. In the following section, I will examine what this approach could have to offer for systematic theology.

[189] Koskenniemi & Lindqvist 2008, 37.
[190] Koskenniemi & Lindqvist 2008, 38-39.

3.3 Animal Apocalypse as Rewritten Bible

In this section, the methodological steps of Koskenniemi & Lindqvist are applied to a concrete text - albeit with necessary modifications and restriction. I have chosen to compare the English translation of the Ethiopic text of the Noah story in *Animal Apocalypse* by George W. E. Nickelsburg (2001) with the corresponding passage in the NRSV translation of the Hebrew Bible (1989). Considering the location of this thesis in the field of systematic theology, I found English the most accessible alternative as the language of reference for my source texts. As my own expertise in Semitic languages does not (yet) allow me to provide my own translation, I chose ones broadly known and accepted as legitimate groundwork among Biblical scholars. Notes on exegetical issues are provided when needed. Both in case of the notes and on contextual issues of history, intention, and form of the *An. Apoc.* text, too, I rely on secondary sources.

I am aware that the choices made here regarding both texts and their exegesis are likely to raise unease for those specialising in the field. Due to the limited scope of this thesis and its focus on developing the concept at hand from the point of view of systematic theology, I have not been able to offer a detailed discussion of the aspects related to the examined text and its context. Thus, an attempt of a more thorough and differentiated analysis must remain a purpose of another study. In this place, the texts compared should be seen in a much more technical light, as almost clinically representing a hypothetical biblical base text embraced by a community and the latter's equally hypothetical narrative interpretation of it. That both texts in fact have a complex transmission history and relationship should remind us of the actual complexity of the issue at hand. In the ideal case, the very impossibility of carrying out this comparison convincingly in real life keeps us the more aware of the inherent risks of such methodological modelling as presented below. When applied properly, the due attention is to be paid for the complexity of contextual factors to avoid both losing the connection to lived reality and using our method to overly impose our own agenda on the examined narrative.

With these preliminary cautions in mind, we now turn to the story of Noah itself as it is found in the Ethiopic text of *Animal Apocalypse*.

3.3.1 The Text

1 Enoch 85:9-89:9	Gen 6:1-9:29
85:9 And I saw in my sleep that white bull, that it grew likewise and became a large white bull, and from it came forth many white cattle, and they were like it. 10 And they began to bear many white cattle, which were like them, and each one followed the other. 86:1 And again I saw with my eyes as I was sleeping. I saw the heaven above, and behold a star fell from heaven, and it arose and was eating and pasturing among those cattle. 2 Then I saw those large and black cattle, and behold, all of them exchanged their pens and their pastures and their calves, and they began to moan, one after the other. 3 And again I saw in the vision, and looked to heaven, and behold, I saw many stars descend and cast themselves down from heaven to that first star. And in the midst of those calves they became bulls and they were pasturing with them in their midst. 4 I looked at them and I saw and behold, all of them let out their organs like horses, and they began to mount the cows of the bulls, and they all conceived and bore elephants and camels and asses. 5 And all the bulls feared them and were terrified before them, and they began to bite with their teeth and devour and gore with their horns. 6 And they began to devour those bulls, and behold all the sons of the earth	6:1 When people began to multiply on the face of the ground, and daughters were born to them, 2 the sons of God saw that they were fair; and they took wives for themselves of all that they chose. 3 Then the Lord said, "My spirit shall not abide in mortals forever, for they are flesh; their days shall be one hundred twenty years." 4 The Nephilim were on the earth in those days—and also afterward—when the sons of God went in to the daughters of humans, who bore children to them. These were the heroes that were of old, warriors of renown.

began to tremble and quake before them, and to flee. 87:1 And again I saw them, and they began to gore one another and devour one another, and the earth began to cry out. *87:2 And I lifted my eyes again to heaven, and I saw in the vision, and behold, there came forth from heaven (beings) with the appearance of white men; four came forth from that place and three with them. 3 And those three who came after took hold of me by my hand and raised me from the generations of the earth, and lifted me onto a high place, and they showed me a tower high above the earth, and all the hills were smaller. 4 And they said to me: ' Stay here until you see all that happens to those elephants and camels and asses and to the stars and to the cattle and all of them.'* *88:1 And I saw one of those four who had come before; he seized that first star that had fallen from heaven, and he bound it by its hands and feet and threw it into an abyss, and that abyss was narrow and deep and desolate and dark. 2 And one of these drew a sword and gave it to those elephants and camels and asses. And they began to strike one another, and the whole earth quaked because of them. 3 And as I looked in the vision, behold, one of those four who had come forth hurled stones from heaven and gathered and took all the great stars, whose organs were like the*	

organs of horses, and bound all of them by their hands and their feet, and threw them in an abyss of the earth.	
	6:5 The Lord saw that the wickedness of humankind was great in the earth, and that every inclination of the thoughts of their hearts was only evil continually. 6 And the Lord was sorry that he had made humankind on the earth, and it grieved him to his heart. 7 So the Lord said, "I will blot out from the earth the human beings I have created—people together with animals and creeping things and birds of the air, for I am sorry that I have made them."
89:1 And one of those four went to <one of the white bulls> and taught it a mystery—trembling as it was. It was born a bull and became a man. And he built himself a vessel and dwelt in it, and three bulls dwelt with him on that vessel, and the vessel was covered and roofed over them.	6:8 But Noah found favor in the sight of the Lord. 9 These are the descendants of Noah. Noah was a righteous man, blameless in his generation; Noah walked with God. 10 And Noah had three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth. 11 Now the earth was corrupt in God's sight, and the earth was filled with violence. 12 And God saw that the earth was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted its ways upon the earth. (*God reveals to Noah: his plan to destroy the earth and establish a covenant with him; instructions for building the ark; and about the animals and food to be taken along*; Gen 8:13-21) 6:22 Noah did this; he did all that God commanded him.

	(*God instructs Noah to go in the ark with his family and the animals*; Gen 7:1-4) 7:5 And Noah did all that the Lord had commanded him. 7:6 Noah was six hundred years old when the flood of waters came on the earth. 7 And Noah with his sons and his wife and his sons' wives went into the ark to escape the waters of the flood. 8 Of clean animals, and of animals that are not clean, and of birds, and of everything that creeps on the ground, 9 two and two, male and female, went into the ark with Noah, as God had commanded Noah.
89:2 And again I lifted my eyes toward heaven, and I saw a high roof, and seven sluices on it, and those sluices were pouring out much water into an enclosure. 3 And I looked again and behold, fissures opened up in the floor in that large enclosure, and that water began to bubble up and rise above the floor, and I was looking at that enclosure until all the floor was covered with water. 4 And water and darkness and mist increased on it and I kept seeing the height of that water, and that water had risen above that enclosure and was overflowing that enclosure and stood on the earth. 5 And all the cattle of that enclosure were gathered together until I saw them sinking and being engulfed and perishing in that water. 6 And that vessel was floating on the waters, but all the bulls and elephants and	7:10 And after seven days the waters of the flood came on the earth. 11 In the six hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month, on the seventeenth day of the month, on that day all the fountains of the great deep burst forth, and the windows of the heavens were opened. 12 The rain fell on the earth forty days and forty nights. 13 On the very same day Noah with his sons, Shem and Ham and Japheth, and Noah's wife and the three wives of his sons entered the ark, 14 they and every wild animal of every kind, and all domestic animals of every kind, and every creeping thing that creeps on the earth, and every bird of every kind—every bird, every winged creature. 15 They went into the ark with Noah, two and two of all flesh in which there was the breath of life. 16 And those that

camels and asses sank to the bottom together with every animal, so that I could not see them. And they were unable to escape but perished and sank in the deep.	entered, male and female of all flesh, went in as God had commanded him; and the Lord shut him in. 17 The flood continued forty days on the earth; and the waters increased, and bore up the ark, and it rose high above the earth. 18 The waters swelled and increased greatly on the earth; and the ark floated on the face of the waters. 19 The waters swelled so mightily on the earth that all the high mountains under the whole heaven were covered; 20 the waters swelled above the mountains, covering them fifteen cubits deep. 21 And all flesh died that moved on the earth, birds, domestic animals, wild animals, all swarming creatures that swarm on the earth, and all human beings; 22 everything on dry land in whose nostrils was the breath of life died. 23 He blotted out every living thing that was on the face of the ground, human beings and animals and creeping things and birds of the air; they were blotted out from the earth. Only Noah was left, and those that were with him in the ark. 24 And the waters swelled on the earth for one hundred fifty days.
89:7 And again I saw in the vision until those water channels were removed from that high roof and the fountains of the floor were stopped up, and other abysses were opened. 8 And the water began to descend into them until the floor was uncovered and that vessel	8:1 But God remembered Noah and all the wild animals and all the domestic animals that were with him in the ark. And God made a wind blow over the earth, and the waters subsided; 2 the fountains of the deep and the windows of the heavens were closed, the rain from the heavens was restrained, 3 and the

settled onto the floor, and darkness withdrew and it became light.	waters gradually receded from the earth. At the end of one hundred fifty days the waters had abated; 4 and in the seventh month, on the seventeenth day of the month, the ark came to rest on the mountains of Ararat. 5 The waters continued to abate until the tenth month; in the tenth month, on the first day of the month, the tops of the mountains appeared. (*Sending out the raven and the dove*; Gen 8:6-12) 8:13 In the six hundred first year, in the first month, on the first day of the month, the waters were dried up from the earth; and Noah removed the covering of the ark, and looked, and saw that the face of the ground was drying. 14 In the second month, on the twenty-seventh day of the month, the earth was dry. *8:15 Then God said to Noah, 16 "Go out of the ark, you and your wife, and your sons and your sons' wives with you. 17 Bring out with you every living thing that is with you of all flesh—birds and animals and every creeping thing that creeps on the earth—so that they may abound on the earth, and be fruitful and multiply on the earth."* 8:18 So Noah went out with his sons and his
89:9 That white bull who had become a man came out of that vessel, and the three bulls with him. And one of those three was white	wife and his sons' wives. 19 And every animal, every creeping thing, and every bird,

like that bull, and one of them was red like blood, and one of them was black.	everything that moves on the earth, went out of the ark by families. (*Noah's offering and God's promise*; Gen 8:20-22) (*God's blessing over Noah and his sons*; Gen 9:1-7) (*The Noahic Covenant*; Gen 9:8-17) 9:18 The sons of Noah who went out of the ark were Shem, Ham, and Japheth. Ham was the father of Canaan. 19 These three were the sons of Noah; and from these the whole earth was peopled. (*Ham sees his father's nakedness and his son Canaan is cursed to be slave to his brothers*; 9:20-27)
89:9c And that white bull departed from them.	9:28 After the flood Noah lived three hundred fifty years. 29 All the days of Noah were nine hundred fifty years; and he died.

3.3.2 Step 1: How Is the Text Changed?

Koskenniemi & Lindqvist's first methodological step encourages comparisons between the rewritten text and its original to detect their similarities and differences. In an authentic case, it would be vital to scrutinise and be aware of the Biblical version used as a base for the rewritten composition. In the case of *An. Apoc.*, it would be crucial to have knowledge on both the variety of possible versions of the Hebrew Bible and the complex transmission history of the text itself, including translation over several languages. However, because we in our hypothetical survey assume that we have the exact version of the textual parent that the original author had before him, or in his mind, it will suffice to note the already differing traditions combined in the Noah story of the Masoretic/NRSV text. As we further assume that there is no difference in language between the base text and its rewritten version, or that such difference is at its best negligible,

we can next proceed to the actual comparison. Along the analysis, I shall investigate the issues surrounding the extra-biblical traditions that Koskenniemi & Lindqvist raise and that, as we noted in 3.2.2, make an interesting case in our Hauerwasian framework.

Changes

When reading the passages in 1 Enoch 85:9b-89:9 against Gen 6-9, the wholly different framework is evident. Beginning with the narrative form itself, the latter tells the Noah story as a single-layered narrative, whereas in 1 Enoch it is rendered as a story in a story.[191] Enoch tells his son Methuselah about a vision that he had in the distant past and the Biblical narrative forms the logical contents of that vision. The narration is structured by Enoch's accounts of himself looking and seeing in the vision, which function as passages over to the next significant twist in the plot. In addition to the narrator's omnipresence in the story of *An. Apoc.* and its form of a vision, the allegorical use of animal figures as the representational guise for the Biblical characters is another immediately striking difference from the text in Gen. Different animal figures to denote different peoples and the different colors of the cattle for moral character[192] are, however, not the only allegorical types figuring on the scene. Stars and white men are prominent, too, as well as the Lord of the sheep and some unfaithful shepherds further on in the story. Even this use of allegory fits the intended form of the text as characteristic for vision accounts of divine mysteries. To my judgement, such an allegorical approach could even be read as a way to bring the Biblical story nearer its new audience by distancing it from its original form and style.

In the table of 3.3.1, we can easily see how differently the respective texts are balanced regarding the various traditions associated with the story of The Great Deluge. Whereas the Gen text rather superficially hastens through the start scene to describe God's resulting discontent with his creature and decision to destroy it altogether,[193] *An. Apoc.* offers a more elaborated narrative about what happened before the actual flood took place. In Enoch's vision the themes of fallen angels and unfallen archangels sent to punish them, familiar from the earlier *Book of Watchers* in 1 Enoch 12-16, take almost half of the section examined here.[194] The fall

[191] These elements of narrative analysis are based on Assefa 2007, 55-117.
[192] There are, however, differing opinions on the specific meanings of the coloring code, as will be seen below.
[193] Gen 6:1-7.
[194] 1 Enoch 86-88.

of the angels (the "stars") and their intercourse with the daughters of men (the "cows") is described in detail in contrast to the brief mention in Gen on how "the sons of God went in to the daughters of humans, who bore children to them."[195] The following account on four white men (the archangels) and their measures against the bewildered fallen stars[196] finds no parallel in Gen 6. In contrast, every passage of God speaking and steering the course of events are left unmentioned in *An. Apoc*.[197] In fact, the "Lord of the sheep" first appears in person from the Egyptian residence of the Israelites onward (the sheep dwelling amongst wolves), as Assefa points out; until then, it is the four white men who operate for justice in the vision.[198] Given the fact that the self-reflection of God over his creation and his covenant with Noah constitutes the fundamental narrative framework in the Gen narrative, the absence of the description of his thoughts and his personal intervention in *An. Apoc.* decisively changes the nature of the narrative. The focus of the narrative shifts from God to the terrestrial characters as the main personage, and his intentions and characteristics, in the beginning of the story indeed even his existence, need to be deduced and interpreted from the occurrences on Earth.

This odd fact may suggest that the era of the cattle is only an introductory episode, the remote genesis of what is to develop into the final battle of the sheep for justice that constitutes the text's real focus.[199] However, the different emphasis on God's action can also be said to

---

[195] 1 Enoch 86:4-5 and Gen 6:4 respectively. The explicit mentioning of Nephilim in Gen 6:4, interestingly indicates that Gen 6 has either triggered an elaborate exegesis in, or is affected by the same, or at least related, tradition as *An. Apoc*. The most popular view seems to be that the Nephilim were giants born as a result of the unnatural intercourse between sons of God and daughters of men. In addition to Nephilim, giants are repeatedly mentioned in antique literature. They are a recurring personage in the Enochic literature, explicitly mentioned in 1 Enoch 12-16, and can be identified with the camels, elephants, and asses in 1 Enoch 86. (Stuckenbruck 2014, 3-7).

[196] 1 Enoch 87:2b-88:3.

[197] E.g., Gen 6:3, 5-7, 13-21; 7:1-4, 23; 8:1, 15, 20-22; 9:1-7.

[198] Assefa 2007, 75, 240-241. Exactly where the first reference to the Lord occurs is unclear, since the Ethiopic and Aramaic texts differ, the former introducing him in 89:14 and the latter in 89:15. Nickelsburg (1999, 368) argues for the Aramaic version, suspecting a misreading of the Greek κριος for κυριος behind the Ethiopic one. Olson (2013, 168) follows Nickelsburg and argues for Jacob's positive leadership, whereas Ego (2005, 176) locates the Lord's first appearance in connection with the Joseph story.

[199] Such a view can be supported by Assefa's (2007, 74, 86-87) reconstruction of the meaning of the cattle as the sheep's ancestors, with the kin of both sheep and cattle as the main character of the story in *An. Apoc* He further (ibid. 71) points out that the cattle play a more passive role in the story than the sheep; even their character is described by colors rather than the prominent metaphors of seeing or straying from the path used to depict the sheep. Most scholars agree on a Uhrzeit-Endzeit typology in *An. Apoc.* that is communicated by using both color white and the narrative's cattle-sheep-cattle scheme (e.g., Laato 2017, 32, 33-36; Gore-Jones 2015, 285-286; Olson 2013, 1-2; Assefa 2007, 86-87; Ego 2005, 184-186, 189-190; Nickelsburg 1999, 354-355). When considering the metaphoric meanings of bulls versus sheep, Gore-Jones and Laato both refer to the bulls' comparative size and strength; Gore-Jones (2015, 278, 285) emphasizes the vigor of the humankind, while Laato (2017, 33) associates this contrast to the patriarch's higher age before Jacob. Olson (2013, 31), in turn, makes an additional and interesting identification of the eschatological white bull in the end of *An. Apoc.* as the "true Jacob" who finally continues the line of white bulls interrupted by the first Jacob (the first representant of the sheep). More often the

demonstrate a different emphasis on theology in the respective texts. Already the description of how it all began and what provoked the Deluge could betray a decisive difference—be it of fundamental art or only situational. In *An. Apoc.*, it is the fallen stars' reckless actions and the resulting alien descendants that give rise to fear, anger, and chaos among the cattle and provoke them to violence towards each other.[200] It is also the stars who are punished first by being bound and thrown in an abyss to wait for the Last Judgement in the end of the vision.[201] The notably absent God does not betray his nature or feelings but lets his angels take care of action for justice.[202] The opposite is the case in Gen. Here God is the main character who unarguably has the longest screen time of all. He speaks to himself and to Noah, gives detailed instructions that are to be followed, and dominates in steering the course of events. The Deluge is his reaction provoked by the corruptness and continually evil intentions of his creation.[203] Whereas in *An. Apoc.*, "all the sons of the earth began to tremble and quake before [the violent cattle]"[204] and "the earth began to cry out"[205] under the pressure of their tumultuous confrontations, the creature in Gen 6 seems to be almost innocently unaware—or perhaps even careless—about

eschatological bull has been associated with the very first white bull in the account, that is, Adam (e.g., Laato 2017, 35; Joseph 2013; Assefa 2007, 311; Nickelsburg 2001, 407), or with the son of man figure in the Book of Daniel (e.g., Nickelsburg 2001, 407; Ego 2005, 185, note 43).

[200] 1 Enoch 86:5-87:2. It is good to note, however, that there had already been an act of violence by a bull against another in *An. Apoc*. (Cain and Abel in 1 Enoch 85:4) before no one star had fallen. Ego (2005, 183) refers to this passage to point out the parallelism of human and angelic evil in *An. Apoc.* in contrast to the Book of Watchers, However, she holds that the humanity should be understood as participating in an overarching sinfulness of the whole (human and angelic) creation rather than as autonomous subjects in history. Assefa (2007, 73), in turn, points out this case of Cain killing his brother Abel as a sign of fragility and inner inconsistency in the family of bulls and sheep. Gore-Jones (2015, 286-287) does not refer to the Cain and Abel episode but mentions the absence of the forbidden fruit in *An Apoc.*, in contrast to the extensive account of the fall of the watchers that she identifies with the origin of sin. According to Kugel (1999, 179-83, 194-203), the role of the sons of God and the Nephilim in the events leading to the flood has also puzzled antique interpreters (ibid. 179). Despite being rarely identified with the origin of sin, there are three main interpretations of how these (partly) celestial creatures contributed to the evil that led to the flood: 1) The sexual act between sons of God and daughters of men itself was sinful, either because of lustful motives, or by insulting the laws of nature set up by God (ibid. 179, 195, 196-197); 2) The new race resulting from this sexual union (according to the Nephilim) was the source of evil (ibid. 179, 195, 197-199); 3) Fallen angels passed along secret knowledge to humans that led them to corruption. This forbidden knowledge was often associated to the craft of weaponry, jewelry, or cosmetics, related to the sins of violence, idolatry, and fornication (ibid. 179, 195, 200-203). These different traditions often merged to such explanations as, for example, that the daughters of men seduced the sons of God by using make up (ibid. 211-2).

[201] 1 Enoch 88.

[202] Assefa 2007, 75. According to Assefa, this is due to the designation of the Lord as the "Lord of the sheep", an interpretation that would be unintelligible without the presence of the sheep in the narrative, even though the Lord also has a relationship to other characters, such as the wild beasts and the bulls (ibid. 75-77.)

[203] Gen 6:5-7.

[204] 1 Enoch 86:6. Some scholars (e.g., Charles 1912, 188; Nickelsburg 2001, 374) suggest that that the author of *An. Apoc.* here forgets his allegorical agenda for a moment and lapses to a non-symbolic language. Olson (2013, 154), however, disagrees and maintains that the expression 'sons' is also used about animals throughout the Hebrew Bible and should thus be taken as a simple Hebraism.

[205] 1 Enoch 87:1.

their miserable condition. Instead, it is God alone who sees it and feels sorry for ever putting a start for such degradable things.

Another key element in the Gen account that is absent from *An. Apoc.* is God's covenant with Noah. The whole long pericopes of Noah bringing forth his offerings to God, God's promise not to ever destroy the earth again as completely, his blessing over Noah and his sons, and, lastly, the establishing of the Noahic covenant are simply not to be found.[206] Instead, the events after the flood are comprised in a brief mention of Noah coming out of the ark in one sentence and departing from his sons in the following.[207] This rather condensed narrative can be said to characterise the *An. Apoc.* version of the Noah story after the detailed description of the chaos caused by the fallen stars and their punishment in the beginning. Depictions of the divine revelation, building and entering the ark are only a matter of a couple of clauses.[208] No mention

[206] Gen 8:20-9, 17.

[207] 1 Enoch 89:9. Alternatively, the fact that Noah is paralleled with Moses in being transformed from an animal into a man the role of them both also as covenant recipients (cf. Assefa 2007, 253). In that case, the Noahic covenant would be considered something that the author expects his readers to know well. The parallelism between the two figures could even indicate that, according to the tradition behind *An. Apoc.*, the Mosaic covenant was already revealed to Noah. Kugel (1999, 224-226) shows how the traditional argument for a Noahic covenant, and a set of "Noahide Laws," develops in order to confront the suspicion of God leaving the humanity on their own until the giving of the Torah, and to explain how patriarchs like Abraham and Joseph could follow God's commandments even prior to the Sinai events. According to Kugel (1999, 224), the "Noahide Laws" were understood as universal and, in being given to Noah and his sons, applicable to all postdiluvian humanity. Based on Gen. 9:4-6, however, the list of laws/commandments read into this passage varies both in number and content from source to source (Ibid. 225-226). Gilders (2009, 187-188) argues for a similar view in the Book of Jubilees. He describes the Noahic covenant as "the first iteration of covenant and the *basis* of subsequent covenants, which are therefore not new covenants, but simply reiterations of that original covenant" (Ibid. 187. Emphasis in the original). Based on this understanding, Gilders maintains that, in Jubilees, the covenant made with Noah—that is, with all humanity, but here apparently only in theory—is the pre-existing relationship that God has intended between himself and the people of Israel (ibid. 187) and that is only fully realized when Israel will rule over the whole earth in Eschaton (ibid. 188). Perhaps the author of *An. Apoc.*, too, represents a similar view. Another view, however, is presented by Ego (2005, 178-179) who notes that *An. Apoc.* locates the decisive event of lawgiving in Ex 15:22-16:36 (especially 15:25) instead of Sinai. According to her, the events of Sinai in *An. Apoc.* are best described as theophanie and the receiving of the stone tablets plays little role (ibid. 179). She suggests that the metaphor of seeing in *An. Apoc.* indicates recognition and insight in God's commandment to be a more relevant aspect than the law and covenant itself (ibid. 180). Thus seen, *An. Apoc.* would testify for a more gnoseological approach to the relationship with God, the Torah, and perhaps the covenant, too, than in the Deuteronomistic history. Noah is not mentioned in this context, since the metaphor of seeing only appears later in *An. Apoc.* representing a (sometimes lacking) characteristic of the people of Israel who from Jacob onwards are depicted as sheep. However, Noah's transformation after being taught a mystery speaks for the writing's somewhat gnoseological character. Ego does not relate the transformation of the two figures with a covenant thinking, but rather as an indication to their legendary character. The transformations themselves will be discussed in more detail below. There is still one contribution that I wish to present to the covenant theme in *An. Apoc.*, namely that of Olson's (2013, 14-15) who interprets the allegory to have been written with the universal blessing of the Abrahamic covenant in mind. Even though he himself must admit that the Abrahamic covenant is not included in the narrative of *An. Apoc.* itself (ibid. 165), he argues for this covenant's overall role for the ideology of the text by showing parallels to Paul's writings in the New Testament (ibid. 242-243)—an aspect also noted by Nickelsburg (2001, 85).

[208] 1 Enoch 89:1-2a.

is made about the animal couples that play a central role in Genesis narrative,[209] except a possible reference to "all the animals"[210] in 1 Enoch 86:6. The episode of Ham seeing his father naked and Canaan getting cursed for that is only potentially vaguely alluded to within the colors of the three cattle exiting the ark with Noah.[211] The only passage that enjoys greater attention from the author of *An. Apoc.* is the Deluge itself: the rain, the flood, the drowning malefactors, and eventually its end.[212] In fact, this passage is the most comparable to its Genesis counterpart in both language, relevance, and relative length, with the absence of the raven-dove episode,[213] the detailed counting of days,[214] and the odd interjection of God as the destroyer[215] from the *An. Apoc.* text as the major notable differences.

Traditions

It is easy to see in the comparison of 3.3.1 how harmonised a version of the Noah story *An. Apoc.* really presents. Whilst the numerous parallel beginnings of the accounts of God's reaction,[216] Noah's entering the ark, the rain falling, the water flooding, [217] etc. challenge the readability of the Genesis text, the story of Noah in *An. Apoc.* proceeds logically and economically without extensive repetition or unexpected déjà-vus. By reducing the reference to the basic "empirical facts" of the Deluge story, the author of *An. Apoc.* avoids burdening his account with theological agendas that could distract the reader from his own message. As a result, we have a kind of Sunday school version of the Noah narrative guised in an allegory of animals.[218] This simplified narrative also suits the genre of a vision account to reduce the

---

[209] Gen 6:13-21; 7:1-4, 8-9, 14-16.

[210] Charles (1912, 23, note 51) suggests that the 'animals' here should be identified with real animals. Reese (1999, 23, note. 51) and Tiller (1993, 264) speculate that the author of *An. Apoc.* here again forgets his allegorical agenda for a moment and lapses to the original narrative tradition he has in mind (cf. note 206 above). Olson (2013, 162), however, does not think that this is a lapse into a non-symbolic language, but prefers 'every (other) living thing' as a better translation.

[211] Gen 9:20-27. The fact that it is Ham's son Canaan who is cursed, not Ham himself, has often bothered both early and modern interpreters since it indicates that God is acting unjustly. Nickelsburg (2001, 376), however, holds that the curse of Canaan and the annihilation of the land of his offspring by Israel in Gen 10:15-18 together explain why Ham is represented as red. The issue of the color coding of Noah's sons is discussed in more detail in note 221 below.

[212] 1 Enoch 89:2b-9 (Gen 7:10-8, 14). It is, however, good to note that the flood account in the Aramaic fragments of *An. Apoc.* is remarkably shorter than in the Ethiopic manuscripts, lacking the description of the Earth as an enclosure with a roof (Nickelsburg 2001, 375-376; Olson 2013, 160-161; Tiller 1993, 258).

[213] Gen 8:6-12.

[214] Gen 7:10-12, 17, 24; 8:3-5, 13-14.

[215] Gen 7:23.

[216] Gen 6:5-10, 12-13.

[217] Gen 7:6-8, 10-18.

[218] This interpretation does not mean that it would be less heavily theologised in elaborate ways as the remaining notes indicate.

amount of non-narrative and other in-baked elements in the final rewritten outcome. However, it seems to me that nothing in the account of the Noah story in *An. Apoc.* indicates the necessity of a detailed knowledge of a literary base text. It would be perfectly sufficient to rely on oral tradition to know the basic narrative plot of the story.

At the same time, the author of *An. Apoc.* shows his awareness of some traditions more elaborately present in the Biblical narrative by alluding to them. The already noted colors of the cattle representing Noah's sons after the Deluge, for instance, could be understood to offer such an allusion. Shem being white, Japheth red, and Ham black accords with the hierarchy set up between them and their descendants at the end of the episode of Noah's drunkenness: Shem will be the leader of them all and Japheth will be able to dwell among him, whereas Ham's descendants will be slave to them both.[219] The colors of the bulls and the blindness/opening of eyes of the sheep further on in *An. Apoc.* are also signs of inherited tradition. Ascribing animal figures belonging to the Israelite family either a strongly positive or a strongly negative attribute

---

[219] There are differing opinions on how the color coding of Noah's offspring should be interpreted. Many scholars identify the colors with the individual sons Shem, Ham, and Japhet in this sequential order: white = Shem, red = Ham, black = Japhet (E.g., Gore-Jones 2015, 278; Nickelsburg 2001, 358, 371). The most exhaustive discussion in my material on the issue is found in Gore-Jones (2015, 278-279). She identifies the meaning of the symbolic colors according to what a Hebrew reader would have intuitively associated them with. According to Gore-Jones, white was a color of "purity and righteousness" and black signified "sin and evil" (ibid. 278). Red was a more puzzling color, especially when related to Ham (ibid.). The most obvious association of red with blood and violence, which is explicitly mentioned in *An.Apoc'*s description of the red son of Noah, seems fitting with what we know about Ham from the Hebrew Bible (ibid.). One possibility would, according to Gore-Jones, be an allusion to the episode of Noah's drunkenness and its consequences (ibid.). However, this is complicated by a comparison with the colors connected to Cain and Abel earlier in the same narrative, Cain being black and Abel red. No analogous using of color-symbols can be identified between the two passages, should they be identified with the individual biblical characters. (Ibid.) Because of this, Gore-Jones supports Tiller's interpretation (1993, 267) who maintains that the colors of Noah's offspring in 1 Enoch 89:9 should rather be interpreted as characterizing the entire postdiluvian humankind. The coloring of Noah's sons would thus not implicate any traditions about the brothers themselves, but maintain that no actual improvement of humanity had followed the events of the flood (Gore-Jones 2015, 279). Ego (2005, 175), who agrees with Gore-Jones as to the significance of white and black, simply leaves the third color red unexplained. It only appears in the citation she presents from 1 Enoch 85:3-8 (ibid.). Olson (2013, 1, 76, 149-150), in turn, resolves the problem of red by suggesting that white, red, and black are characterizations of an individual's status as (non)elect so that white would be reserved for the elect, black for the non-elect, and red for the neutral; though even in Olson, the colors carry a certain double meaning of elect/righteous and non-elect/unrighteous (ibid. 76). Accordingly, Noah's sons in the Genesis account are identified with the different colors in the following manner: white = Shem, red = Japhet, black = Ham, which Olson himself attributes to the majority of scholars (ibid. 163). The key for his understanding is that the elected status seems to presuppose taking part in the lineage of Israel, which criterium Abel does not fulfil even though his offering is found pleasing in the eyes of the Lord in Gen 4:3-5. It may seem, however, rather unsuitable to identify red simply as a sign of neutrality regarding an elected status, considering that red in this verse is further specified with the attribute of blood which hardly has a very neutral taste to it. Indeed, Olson, too, sees here a possible allusion to martyrdom, which could also explain the omission of the tradition about the contrasting offerings of the two brothers (ibid. 146-147). An explanation for Japheth being black is offered by Nickelsburg (2001, 376), who agrees with Gore-Jones of the association of red with blood (see my note 221 above). He suggests that black could be an allusion to "the gloom of the north" where Japheth's offspring was believed to have settled (Nickelsburg 2001, 376).

demonstrates the transmission of processes that decide how the respective characters are valued and how their role is seen for the overarching story.[220] While in some places, this evaluation of *An. Apoc.* accords with the Biblical text, as seems to be the case with Noah and his sons, at others it seems to deviate from it. It is, however, good to remember that the Hebrew Bible text itself entails several different, even contradicting strains of tradition regarding both the characters and events—the Noah story is but one example of this phenomenon. It is thus only natural that a harmonising approach cannot include them all.

In addition to alluding to Biblical traditions, the Noah story of the *An. Apoc.* text bears witness to other traditions that either lack a parallel or are only alluded to in passing in the Gen counterpart and are found within other books of the Masoretic text. One obvious example is the already mentioned narrative sequence of the fallen stars and their punishment. The Gen text only shortly refers to the events of this tradition on the background of the Deluge, whereas the author of *An. Apoc.* gives a clearer and more thorough account of those events.[221] Related to the tradition of the fallen angels and the Nephilim is that of the archangels represented by the four white men in *An. Apoc*. These figures are not mentioned in the Gen account of the Deluge,

[220] E.g., Gore-Jones 2015; Ego 2005, 175-176; Olson 2013, 8, note 18. Both Gore-Jones (2005, 277-281) and Ego (2005, 178) underline the significance of the associations created by using certain kind of animals for the different people in the vision account. Olson (2013, 149-150), in turn, lays a special emphasis on the coloring regarding the sheep as he maintains that "not *all* sheep are white, or completely white" (ibid. 150, emphasis in the original). He also has a slightly different emphasis on how to understand the colors; for him, the designation of white is first and foremost a sign of an elected status, even though he admits that both black and white do play an additional role related to their association with evil and good respectively (see my previous note).

[221] Traditions related to the role of the fallen angels and the Nephilim, or giants, in the corruption of the earth prior to the flood is already discussed above in note 202. In addition to those explanations of the evil, Kugel (1999, 205-209) also presents different traditions that circulated in the early Judaism about how God punished the celestial things that probably would have survived the flood (ibid. 197, 199). These traditions are mostly found written in 1 Enoch and Jubilees (see the sample text passages in ibid. 205-207, as well as Stuckenbruck 2014, 1-57). The flood was thus considered as the measures of God against the unrighteous earthly beings (that is, humans, but according to some (Philo's Questions and Answers in Genesis 2:9; 1 Enoch 7:5 in Aramaic; Jubilees; Midrash Tanḥuma, Noaḥ 12) animals, too; see ibid. 200, 187-188), or as a means of purifying the earth after all violence and murder caused by the giants (ibid. 199-200), whereas angels and other abnormal creatures had to be punished in another way. In addition to *An. Apoc.*, the binding of the fallen angels to wait for their final judgement in the Eschaton is attested at least in the Book of Watchers (1 Enoch 1-36), the Book of Giants (see 3.1.2 above), and Jubilees (Kugel 1999, 205-206). Kugel (ibid. 205) suggests that this tradition might be related to Isa. 24:21-22 that reads as follows: "On that day the Lord will punish the host of heaven in heaven, and the kings of the earth on the earth: They will be gathered together as prisoners in a pit; they will be shut up in a prison, and after many days they will be punished" (cited as in Kugel 1999, 205). Similarly, the punishment of the giants is explicitly found in the Book of Watchers and Jubilees, while Kugel finds possible hints to a similar tradition in Sibylline Oracles 1:115-9 (Kugel 1999, 206-207). According to these sources, the giants were punished by making them kill each other, which in Kugel's view could even explain the violence corrupting the earth in Gen 6:11, 13 (ibid. 206). Stuckenbruck (2014, 15-24, 27-30, 33-35, 55-57) maintains that, in the ancient sources, the giants were punished both through mutual violence and through the flood, but also according to some (e.g., Book of Watchers, Book of Giants, Book of Jubilees) even allowed an existence beyond that destruction as evil spirits. He notes, however, that in *An. Apoc.* the destruction of the giants through the flood was definitive (ibid. 22-23).

and only two of them appear elsewhere in the Masoretic text by name.[222] As mentioned, the white men/archangels take the role of divine action in the whole Deluge narrative of the *An. Apoc*. to the point that, instead of God himself as in the Gen text, it is one of them that "taught [Noah] a mystery."[223] This goes in sharp contrast to the covenant-centered account of Gen where God takes personal action when sovereignly steering the course of events.[224] A further possible trace of a tradition differing from that of Genesis is the darkness associated with the events of the Deluge. Along the flooding waters "darkness and mist increased on [the earth]"[225] and after the vessel (the ark) settling on the now dried earth, "darkness withdrew and it was light."[226] Perhaps this language is only made use of for an esthetical effect, but I hold it probable that a more elaborate and overarching tradition, ideology, or cosmology makes itself known to us here.[227]

An interesting case regarding the possibly extra-biblical traditions that deserves our attention is the person of Noah in the *An. Apoc.* narrative. Not much is said about him, but the little that is said is surprising. At first, Noah is presented as a white bull in accordance with him being a good man and belonging to humans in contrast to the Nephilim represented by camels, elephants, and asses.[228] However, right after receiving the instruction from the white man

---

[222] The only book in the Masoretic text that refers to archangels is the Book of Daniel where Raphael and Michael are mentioned by name. In the Greek Old Testament there is an additional role played by Raphael in the Book of Tobit (Barnes 2002). Both books, however, stem from the second temple period along with *An. Apoc.* (Browning 2009a; Browning 2009b).
[223] 1 Enoch 89:1.
[224] See, however, note 209 above.
[225] 1 Enoch 89:4.
[226] 1 Enoch 89:8-9.
[227] E.g., Olson (2013, 162), Nickelsburg (2001, 376), Reese (1999, 23, note 49) find a possible Mesopotamian source behind the darkness-light effect found in the flood narrative here. Tiller (266-267), in turn, speculates on its parallelism to the creation narrative (see also Reese 1999, 23). For Dillmann (1853, 258) the addition of darkness and mist is merely a common midrash that refers to the chaos of the flood.
[228] At this point in the narrative of *An.Apoc*., all humanity is still represented by cattle of different colours, and the differentiating of people by using different animal species is only introduced after the flood.

"trembling as it was,"[229] it is accounted that "[i]t was born a bull and became a man."[230] Even the end of Noah's life seems exceptional as it is simply stated that he "departed from [his sons]."[231] Of course, it is possible that the departure is nothing but a euphemism for Noah's dead accounted in Gen 9:28 and that his metamorphosis only underlines the notion that he "found favor in the sight of the Lord […,] was a righteous man, blameless in his generation […, and] walked with God."[232] On the other hand, Noah's becoming a man is reserved for only one more extraordinary figure in *An. Apoc.*, Moses. Because of this, it has been argued that such an occurrence could indicate an underlying tradition of a divine-human ascension in the heavens without having to die, as we apparently find in cases such as Elijah and more speculatively Enoch in the Masoretic text.[233] An important question is, however, whether the paralleling of

[229] 1 Enoch 89:1. Here there is some ambiguity surrounding the manuscripts' reading of the phrase in Ge'ez, some saying that Noah trembled, others the contrary. This fact leads Olson (2013, 157, 159) to conclude that there is practically no way of knowing which one represents the original translation. Laato (2017, 48) and Nickelsburg (2001, 375) stick to the interpretation presented here and argue that Noah's trembling could be a natural reaction to being instructed by an angel, or perhaps a more essential description of Noah's righteous and god-fearing character. For Laato, Noah's trembling is a sign of his belonging to the righteous, who tremble at God's word in Isa. 66: 2, 5 (Laato 2017, 49). He notes that the same Ge'ez word for "tremble" that is attributed to Noah after his lesson in the divine mystery also appears later in *An. Apoc.* (1 Enoch 89:31), describing the Israelites' reaction to God's revelation at Sinai (ibid. 48). As an argument for the alternative variant of the phrase, which would translate to "without his trembling", Olson suggests that the figure of Noah might be contrasted with "the children of the earth" in 1 Enoch 86:6 who were trembling before the aggressive elephants, donkeys, camels, and cattle (Olson 2013, 159).

[230] 1 Enoch 89:1. Human figures in *An. Apoc.* appear to stand for celestial beings of some kind whilst humans are represented by animals, which indicates some kind of angelic transformation of Noah. However, this particular transformation is a disputed one, since there is no corresponding passage in the Aramaic fragments. Instead, the whole rest of the verse 1 is lacking after "taught", which renders the originality of Noah's transformation questionable. Scholars are thus divided in their opinion as to if the transformation should be seen as an imitation of that of Moses in 1 Enoch 89:36 or if it belongs to the original account. (cf. Olson 2013, 158; Nickelsburg 2001, 368, note 89:1b).

[231] 1 Enoch 89:9.

[232] Gen 6:9.

[233] Ego 2005, 177-178; Nickelsburg 2001, 376-377. However, Ego locates Noah's transformation in 1 Enoch 89:9 rather than in 89:1 as do most scholars (cf. Laato 2017, 36; Olson 2013, 158; Nickelsburg 2001, 375; Assefa 2013, 253) and thus connects it with Noah's death (Ego 2005, 177). Accordingly, she considers it problematic that Moses was transformed before he built the house for the Lord in 89:36 whereas his death is attested in 89:38 after the deaths of both Aaron and the Exodus generation and thus no direct correlation between his death and transformation can be maintained (ibid. 177-178). Even still, she suggests that there could be traditions on the background of the story according to which even Moses was taken into the heavenly court to fulfil his priestly service there (ibid. 178). Olson (2013, 158; see also Nickelsburg 2001, 375; Laato 2017, 37), in turn, points out the fact that both Noah and Moses experience their transformation immediately before they start building the vessel (89:1) and the house (89:36) respectively. A popular explanation for this condition, going back to Dillmann (1853, 257), is that the author would have been foreign to the idea of animals engaging in building projects. However, Olson confronts this argument by referring to the verses 89:72-3 where there are sheep building a temple in *An. Apoc*. Instead, he suggests that there might be an effort to harmonize the Masoretic tradition of Noah building the ark with another tradition found in 1En 67:2 in the Parables where the constructer of the ark is an angel. At the same time, he notes that no parallel tradition about building the tabernacle is attested in any Jewish sources known to date, which weakens the argument also for the case of Noah. (Ibid.) Even the identification of the house with the tabernacle in this verse is disputed; for discussion on the topic, see Himmelfarb (2007, 228-231) and Laato (2017, 39-41). On the other hand, there are traditions about Moses achieving angelic status that find no parallel regarding Noah (Olson 2013, 158-159). As Olson points out (2013, 159, note 31), only traditions known to attribute Noah with angelic/extraordinary appearance are connected to his birth, with no relation to his receiving the

these two figures is deliberate or only preserving unrelated traditions associated with them respectively.[234] This question, however, is beyond the scope of the current project and must remain a topic of another study.

3.3.3 Step 2: Why Is the Text Changed?

In 3.3.2, we saw some decisive differences in both form and content between the Noah story in *An. Apoc.* and Gen respectively. I also noted some relevant aspects of different traditions, their presence and absence in the examined texts. Now, I turn to the question of why the text is changed and what the intentions of the author might have been, if any, when composing such a differing account from that in his base text. In this section, I proceed more strictly according to the three aspects taken up by Koskenniemi & Lindqvist: the intended audience, (non)intentionality of changes made, and the adaptation of the original text to the new situation.

Audience

From the perspective of the intended audience of *An. Apoc.*, a whole series of books could be written about the language once we start speculating the issue. Because of the multiple

message from God about the flood (For Noah's miraculous birth, see further Kugel 1999, 218-219; Stuckenbruck 2014, 58-77.) Olson (2013, 158) also maintains that there is no unambiguous answer to the question of whether Noah's transformation was of temporary or permanent character. He leans towards the former in relation to both Noah and Moses (cf. ibid. 177; see also Assefa 2007, 73 who locates the transformation of both to their construction work). Laato (2017, 36) agrees with Olson of a metaphoric connection between man and angel in the transformations of Moses and Noah. While Olson takes the Abrahamic covenant as the interpretative key to *An. Apoc.*, Laato instead aims at explaining the text's metaphors with a referential world (cf. under 'Reality' in 2.3.2 above) based on the book of Isaiah (ibid. 31). He thus suggests that Moses' angelic transformation can be explained with Isa 63:11 and Ex 7:1 (ibid. 37-38). For Noah's transformation, he offers Isa 54:9 ("To me this is like the days of Noah, when I swore that the waters of Noah would never again cover the earth. So now I have sworn not to be angry with you, never to rebuke you again." Cited as in Laato 2017, 38.) as a possible explanatory passage. His main argument is that, combined with the eternal covenant in Gen 9:8-17, the author could have drawn the conclusion that Noah was taken into the heavenly court without dying and thus become an angel. The key for this understanding is to associate God's eternal covenant with the person of Noah, since the waters in Isa 54:9, too, are directly related to him. If God's covenant with Noah was eternal, then how could Noah have died? Surely, he must have been taken to heaven in order for God to keep this promise (Ibid. 38). Laato finds further support for this argument by paralleling his key passages Isa 54:9-10 and 63:11-12 and pointing out that a rescue of the righteous from the chaos of waters is indicated in the connection of both Noah and Moses respectively (ibid.). None of these authors, however, discusses the fact that Elijah, who according to the Masoretic text de facto was taken into heavens before his death, does not undergo a transformation into man in *An. Apoc.*—he is simply lifted up to a high place (1Enoch 89:52). This could be a natural choice in the context of earlier Enochic writings where the traditions of Noah's extraordinary birth were integrated and elaborated (See, e.g., Stuckenbruck 2014, 58-77).

[234] See my previous note 235, as well as note 209 above.

translations of the book, both the original author with his intended audience and the translators with theirs should be considered. However, what I said about the language issue in 3.3.1 also applies here: due to the hypothetical approach taken in this thesis, the questions of language are considered as of secondary importance. In contrast, the other question that Koskenniemi & Lindqvist raise regarding the audience—How much does the writer expect the audience to know about the story being rewritten? —is highly relevant.

As we saw in 3.3.1, *An. Apoc.* presents a harmonised and rather comprised account of the Noah story compared to that of Gen. No detailed knowledge of the Biblical narrative, such as dates or numbers, is required for the audience to understand the events of *An. Apoc*. However, the *An. Apoc.* text includes several allusions to broader traditions behind the text itself, as I have previously shown. Such is the case especially when it comes to recognising the different characters, their species, and colors. It thus seems that the audience is expected to possess intuitive traditional knowledge of the different symbolical auras and narrative roles attached to the different Biblical figures so as not to miss the author's intentions. This knowledge can be "Biblical," as is the case with the colors of Noah's sons, or it can be partly extra-biblical, as might be the case with Noah. Important here, to my mind, are the notions of Assefa and Ego who emphasise *An. Apoc.* as a written history of Israel. Even though they approach the issue from slightly different points of view, they both illuminate exactly the point at hand about the function of the allegory in Enoch's vision. Assefa describes the story of *An. Apoc.* as a family saga of the sheep where the cattle play the role of their ancestors. It is the genealogical bondage established through generations of bulls and sheep that creates the consistency of the narrative.[235] The audience is thus expected to identify with this family, understanding its history to be their own to find themselves in the narrative. For Ego, too, the history of Israel is the focus of the *An. Apoc.* narrative, even though its most important function for her is to buttress the authority of the eschatological part of the text.[236] However, such buttressing implicitly assumes readers' identification with the text, similar to that suggested by Assefa. From this identification point of view, without any inherited external knowledge of the good and bad characters or different periods of time in the story it would remain incomprehensible and thus fail to fulfil its purpose.

[235] Assefa 2007, 86-87.
[236] Ego 2005, 186-190, 193.

Intentionality of Changes

As listed above in 3.3.1, the extensive changes made to the base text in *An. Apoc.* can hardly go unnoticed. The whole narrative framework being changed from a one-layered narrative to a story in a story, the genre of a vision account, and the allegorical form all reveal the author's changed agenda. Several scholars have characterised *An. Apoc.* as military propaganda, where the increasing tension between the clan of the sheep (including the bulls of the beginning) and their enemies results in an exhortation to a final battle and the restoration of all.[237] Whether or not one is ready to agree with this critical interpretation, it is undeniable that the Biblical narrative in *An. Apoc.* is used to serve a purpose beyond itself. The history of Israel is re-ideologized with the help of traditions already underlying it by radically changing the framework and thus distancing the narrative from its Biblical roots. The Biblical narrative is taken seriously as a historical account of the fate of the people of Israel and continued with the more recent historiography until the present of the rewritten text. In this way, the past narrative is bound to *our* reality for the author and his readers and thus made into *our* past in an emphatically personal way. Ego is likely to be right in maintaining that presenting the history in form of a vision from a distant past revealed to, and further handed down by, an authoritative personage with a special relationship to God, is used as a means to intensify the text's influence over its readers.[238] A framework that makes such intimate claims on the reader's current reality offers possibilities of identification and meaning for his difficult situation; everything is as it should be, and there will be justice and restoration one day.

Whereas the broader narrative framework is a change that is rightly understood in the context of the whole *An. Apoc.* composition, the other changes identified in 3.3.1 can more easily be related to the specific Noah story. One obvious change is the proportional refocusing of the traditions for the advantage of the introductory scene of the fallen angels and their punishment. Practically, what in Gen 6 was referred to in a couple of sentences took up over one half of the whole Noah story in *An. Apoc*. In contrast, the real main character of the Genesis version, God with his lengthy monologues, was left out altogether from the *An. Apoc.* Text. As a result, the whole theological tradition of the Noahic covenant that appears so important for the redactor of the final version in the Masoretic text was also omitted from *An. Apoc*.[239] These changes can,

[237] E.g., Olson 2013, 5, 90; Venter 1997, 81-3. Assefa (2007, 332), in turn, argues for a pacifistic interpretation.
[238] Ego 2005, 173.
[239] See under 'Changes' in 3.3.2 above.

of course, be explained simply as an intervention for a better readability. For example, the lengthy sequence rendering the story of the fallen stars and the white men can be interpreted as an explanatory interjection, even an unintentional one accounting for a taken for granted continuation of an inherited tradition. Omitting the whole covenant talk of Gen, on the other hand, could be so taken for granted that the author feels the unnecessity of further complicating his narrative.[240] However, as already indicated, these changes could also be intentionally led by a theological or ideological agenda. The absence of God and his discontent with the evil inclinations of his creature contrasted with the presence of the fallen angels contributing to chaos and violence among the bulls could be a clue for a differing concept of the origin of evil in *An. Apoc.* compared to Gen.[241] Another way of explaining possible intentionality behind the changes is to consider them from the point of view of *An. Apoc.* as a literary product with form and message, so that both theological-ideological and stylistic aspects become decisive. What I mean is that, on the one hand, a view of a progressive revelation could be detected on the background so that the covenant and Lord of the sheep only become relevant later, in the era of the sheep. On the other hand, the apocalyptic tenor of the whole vision could explain why such gloomy events as the fallen stars bringing along chaos, the cosmic attack on these by the white men, and the destruction of the flood should be described at length and the restorative Noahic covenant left aside.

As noted above in 3.3.1, the actual Deluge narrative that follows the episode with the fallen stars in *An. Apoc.* is presented in a very comprised and harmonised form in comparison to the Genesis version. Even the more thorough description of the flood and drowning of the evil ones lacks the repetitions and the recurring time updates of the original. The animals taken onboard in the ark in Genesis are left out from the narrative, as are the episodes of sending out the raven and the dove and of Ham seeing Noah's nakedness. These harmonising omissions and rearrangements are likely to be only esthetical, to increase the "fluency of the narrative,"[242] since at least in the case of Ham and possibly in that of the animals the author betrays his acquaintance with the traditions.[243] They were simply not relevant for the purpose of the composition and would have distracted the reader from the text's main intention. The character of Noah, too, could be well suited for the category of unintentional changes—even when there

---

[240] Cf. note 209 above.
[241] See the discussion in 3.3.2 above.
[242] As Koskenniemi & Lindqvist (2008, 37) put it. See 3.2.2 above.
[243] See notes 213 and 221 as well as 212 above respectively.

seems to be almost more said about his person in the *An. Apoc.* version than in Genesis. Even in the case that *An. Apoc.* witnesses a Noah tradition different from that of Genesis, this does not evidence an argument for the author intentionally changing the original text. Similarly to the narrative about the fallen stars discussed above, the difference of *An. Apoc.'s* Noah could be explained by the domineering influence of a strong tradition that the author naturally accepts and does not think to question. Such interpretation seems even more convincing when it is noted that the special character of Noah seems to have little relevance for the *An. Apoc.* narrative as a whole. Furthermore, it is only logical that exceptional figures play a central role in the text's Enochic context, whether they structure the history of Israel or not.

Adaptation of the Original

Above, I have touched upon the issue of adaptation as I discussed the changes in the narrative framework of *An. Apoc*. Now, I continue that strain of thought into the questions of what and how much the author wishes to persuade audiences to relate the Biblical narrative to their own situation. To keep it concise, it could be stated that the author of *An. Apoc.* aims to build a close relationship between his audience and the Biblical narrative by encouraging to identify with the narrative as *their* own past in hopes of getting them existentially involved in the cosmology he depicts. When achieved, this involvement would change, or perhaps reinforce, the readers' "way of looking at the world"[244] so that they start reading their own situation through the apocalyptic reality of *An. Apoc*. Even the view of the composition as military propaganda seems less far-fetched in such light. The fact that most scholars agree on the dating of *An. Apoc.* in the Maccabean/Hasmonean period and its locating in the circles of Judas Maccabeus strengthens the case even further.[245] How this more overarching agenda takes expression in the specific episode of the Noah story is more difficult to say, as the section only represents a part of a kind of prologue for the real action starting with the sheep. Perhaps the pericope could be said to lay the cosmic foundation against which the later history of the sheep should be read and understood, namely as a violent tension between the unfaithful and the representants of justice that reaches all the way from the realm of cosmic powers to the historical reality.

[244] See 2.3.2 above.
[245] See 3.1.3 above.

3.4 Discussion

In the above discussions on the Noah story in *An. Apoc.* as Rewritten Bible, I have demonstrated how one can approach a narrative that tells a Biblical story in a new framework making use of the suggested methodology of Koskenniemi & Lindqvist. Even though the scope of this thesis only allows an elementary comparison of two texts—and a fundamentally artificial one at that—I hope to have established some useful aspects of an analysis of Biblical narration outside the canonical text itself. In this chapter, I attempt to further integrate these insights won in a more elaborate suggestion as to how the achievements of the Rewritten Bible discourse examined in chapters 2 and 3 could be of use when talking about God in an Hauerwasian framework.

The main issue throughout the thesis has been how I envision the compatibility of the two concepts under examination. It might indeed not be fully evident how these two could work together for an outcome that is fruitful in the context of systematic theology. As I mentioned in the beginning of chapter 3, analysing Biblical narratives from the point of view of Hauerwas's concept of the Christian story requires widening the scope beyond written or even orally transmitted texts—how, then, could a methodology specifically developed for literary material serve any meaningful purpose in such a context? However, whereas Hauerwas's emphasis on embodying as the basic form of telling God's tale definitely deserves its due appreciation, in order to make visible narrative elements in a Christian person's and community's embodied reality, a methodology like Koskenniemi & Lindqvist's can be useful. The strength of Koskenniemi and Lindqvist's approach in this respect is their consequent distaste of any kind of unprovable speculation, as will be shown in the following. Even though this thesis departs from their view as to the usefulness of speculation itself, it readily approves of the resulting methodological skepticism that requires a caution to be kept in mind at every level of textual analysis of a rewritten Biblical story.

Above in chapter 2.1, I stated that the process of telling and embodying God's tale in Hauerwas can be depicted as a continual process of rereading the Biblical text preserved in the Scriptural canon of the Church. In Hauerwas's vision, namely, it is elementarily the intuition of the reader, or recipient, of the Biblical story that translates to embodiment of the very story of God making it real in the contingent reality. Described in this way, the concept of telling God's tale comes

astonishingly close to what we learned from Laato and Brooke as they identified rereading processes manifested in the reader's "referential world" or "way of looking at the world" respectively in chapter 2.3. Both concepts are broader than mere textual facts of what can be found in literary explorations of how texts differ from each other. Indeed, they touch upon the very same intuitive aspect of rereading processes as Hauerwas's concept of embodiment. Even though Laato and Brooke's intellectual descriptions of what is behind the intuitive tend to abstraction more than Hauerwas would allow within his more pragmatical approach, the former lift an important aspect of narrating stories on the table. Because Hauerwas writes as an ethicist, and because he lays the very foundation of his system on the avoidance of absolutizing descriptions of "what is behind," he quite logically locates the real action in the life and practices of the Christian community reading its Scripture. Even though there can be no doubt that the "what" of the Bible matters for Hauerwas, the more important side still is the "how" of the whole; what the Bible says wins its relevance by how the story is handled by the community on the one hand, and how the form of the canon can form the life of the community analogously to itself on the other hand. However, such an approach cannot but downplay the fact that texts, both oral and literary, still play a major role for identities, communication, and formation of human communities. Brooke's notion about individual memory betraying a person's "mental activities and mind's retention, some of which is textual,"[246] is only a useful reminder of that reality.

It is against this background that I wish my analysis of the Noah story in *An. Apoc.* to be evaluated. Applying the methodological skepticism of Koskenniemi & Lindqvist in a concrete text shows—even in a shortcut version of analysis as presented above—the multifaceted complexity within retelling a Biblical story. The first step of analysis, the question of how the text is changed, brings us right in the middle of uncertainties created by oral and written tradition existing and developing parallel to one another. Despite the scope of my project requiring questions of language, translation, and canon formation to be omitted from my hypothetical case, their actual presence can be sensed throughout despite their methodological absence. In fact, my conviction is that this sense of complexity should always serve as an obligatory wake-up call when analysing any Biblical rewriting (or rereading) since the base texts differ both in composition, canonicity, translation, and availability throughout the Judeo-

[246] Brooke 2014, 121.

Christian history.[247] Turning further to the second step of Koskenniemi & Lindqvist, the why of the changes in a rewritten text, we were led to dive even deeper into the parallel reality of written and unwritten as it introduced to us the finest lines between intentionality and unintentionality. What we could learn from our skeptical scrutiny at that point was that very little can be taken for granted when deciding the motives behind a rewritten literary product. We identified possible contexts and traditions that the author transferred into his text, and we matched these further with his expectations of his audience in order to make the text intelligible to them. The interplay of written and unwritten that can be sensed throughout the analysis presents but one more manifestation of the author's connectedness to the community, in and with which he was living. This notion of the community as a precondition for the author's intuition, both intentionally and unintentionally manifest in the text, strengthens its match in the picture drawn by Hauerwas in his ethics.

Ultimately, the narrative framework of Hauerwas's concept establishes storytelling as the most basic structure of human existence and its different expressions.[248] This narrative structure is fundamentally the form that God has chosen for his own existence in the contingent world, that is, as his own story embodied in the life of devout communities and individuals. When taken seriously, this analogy of form should even find its continuation in the more explicit God-talk, even in an analysis of any occasions that can be seen as narrations of the story of God. As the Bible already serves as a critical corrective of the God-telling communities in Hauerwas's thought, it is also well suited for a researcher interrogating an extra-biblical narrative telling a Biblical story as a locus for God's story to be realised. When this notion of the Bible as a crucial corrective is further combined with community-based intuition of individuals noted above, and the central role the latter plays for the rereading and narrating of God's story, the usefulness of Koskenniemi & Lindqvist's methodology for our purposes might appear more evident. As we have seen, the methodological skepticism that they represent, and that fundamentally aims at questioning every too hasty a conclusion, offers a most suitable help for investigating narrations of God. The methodology as presented above both takes into account the multiple forms of a

[247] The above is no unimportant notion from an ecumenical point of view either, given the fact that even today different authoritative versions of the Holy Scripture are prominent in communities that go under the label of Christian. One could even say that Hauerwas' whole concept of the Church as a contingent community—or rather: contingent communities—combined with its form as analogous to the discursive truth manifested in the Biblical canon draws its attractiveness from this factual multiplicity of Christian communities. Even with its normatively pacifist pretext, Hauerwas's system as such in no way discourages different manifestations of Christianity in the specific communities.

[248] Cf. Hauerwas 1983, 25-26.

Biblical base text as reference and highlights the incorporated status of the rereading individual in his own community and historical situation. As such, it thus creates an atmosphere of open questions and a thousand and one possibilities of interpretation through which to approach Biblical narrations under examination. In my opinion, such an approach appears nearest to compatible with aspirations of achieving narrative, non-absolutising—and thus analogous to what Hauerwas envisions—knowledge of the ways in which God is narrated in whatever form.

4 Conclusion

In this last chapter, I shall present the results of the above investigations. I begin by summarizing my observations about the compatibility of Hauerwas's narrative ethics and Rewritten Bible (4.1) and some of their possible implications for systematic theology (4.2). At the end of this chapter (4.3), I shall present some reflections on other topics of investigation related to the concepts issued in this thesis.

4.1 Hauerwas and Rewritten Bible

In chapter 2 of this thesis, I first presented the concepts of Stanley Hauerwas's narrative ethics according to his *The Peaceable Kingdom* and Rewritten Bible with its surrounding scholarly discussion. Having done that, I then identified intersecting aspects and showed mutual compatibility between these two perspectives. The most significant result of my analysis was that the aspects of authority and faithfulness constitute the core substance of both examined concepts and thus the basis for their mutual compatibility. The seemingly contradicting view on a scriptural canon, too, proved a mere optical illusion at a closer look. Instead, both concepts witness to an extremely complex dynamic of oral, written, and intuitional tradition intermingling in the concept of the Bible, with the sole distinction being the one between Hauerwas's normativity of a pious insider and the pursued objective look of Rewritten Bible scholars. According to these observations, I stated that the story of God told and embodied by the devout communities and individuals in Hauerwas can very well be conceived as a continual process of rereading their Bible—a view that finds parallels especially in Antti Laato's and George Brooke's respective views of Rewritten Bible.[249] In that way, the lived life and stories of a religious community become indeed their God rewritten. A God who has chosen to exist through his story told by contingent communities, as Hauerwas suggests, is a figure of ever-changing expressions. Such a statement from God can hardly be overlooked by systematic theology, where a narrative framework as that of Hauerwas's is taken seriously.

[249] See 'Reality' in 2.3.2 above.

4.2 An Inquiring Approach to God-talk

Having demonstrated the compatibility of the two concepts in chapter 2, I aimed at showing what practical consequences this stated compatibility could have for systematic theology. Chapter 3 was thus an inquiry of ways to understand how Biblical narrations outside of the Bible could be approached, analyzed, and reproduced in scholarly discourse. Since a Hauerwasian framework presupposes a certain grammar of storytelling as the basic form of both human and godly existence in the contingent world, God-talk, too, necessarily takes the form of a narrative rather than that of metaphysics. [250] Treating the Hauerwasian telling and embodying God's story as a Rewritten Bible is thus methodologically reasonable. At the same time, however, all forms of absolutising and searching for a meaning behind the narrative expression are foreign to Hauerwas's concept. Therefore, I found Erkki Koskenniemi & Pekka Lindqvist's methodology for a Rewritten Bible analysis suitable for a respectful dealing with the story of God à la Hauerwas. Koskenniemi & Lindqvist's inquiring touch and methodological skepticism ideally remind the researcher of the many facets involved in the transmission process of a Biblical text and the danger of hustling too hastily behind the examined rereading itself. The case study of Animal Apocalypse was my attempt to give a concrete example of these virtues by randomly choosing a sample text to apply Koskenniemi & Lindqvist's methodology.

As a systematic theologian, however, my concern reaches further than that. When examining phenomena from the perspective of a researcher in systematic theology of Christianity, the ultimate result of one's inquiries is to be able to say something about, or in some other way give expression to, the God of the Christian. In a Hauerwasian framework, such a task is defined by both the prerequisite of the narrative form of God's existence for human beings and avoiding absolutizing approaches to this narrative God. In other words: to be true according to Hauerwasian thinking, a theological argument must take a narrative form that does justice to the narratives presented by its sources. This means, firstly, that such an argument must preserve or make evident the narrative, often even biographical, boundness of its sources and accept their potentiality of narrating God. Secondly, a theological argument must have a sense of awareness of its indebtedness to the conversational, that is, conflicting truth about God that is so central a feature in Hauerwas's epistemology. And lastly, a theological argument should never forget the

[250] Cf. Hauerwas 1983, 25-26.

corrective function of the sacred scripture that it shares with its sources. A theological discussion described above cannot thus take the form of a totalizing narrative but of an inquiring one, mindful of the lives formed by its source narratives and sensitive to the potentials within these to develop its own story of God. Such an approach to a theological God-talk requires, indeed, a methodological skepticism like Koskenniemi & Lindqvist's in order not to absolutise itself. But in addition, it also requires boldness of accepting what many would call speculation as the only solid basis for its own formation.

4.3 Some Thoughts for Future Elaboration

This thesis has been able to offer only a scratch on the surface of a much greater issue that needs to be investigated more thoroughly in future work. Before closing this chapter, I would like to point out some interesting cases for future research. Firstly, from the perspective of developing new forms of God-talk, the next step would be to examine ways of narrating Biblical content in different contexts and bring them into conversation with each other. It might be easiest to start with some more clear cases before turning to the more implicit narrative expressions of, e.g., ways of life. A related aspect in this regard is the fact of cultural and even polemical retellings of Biblical themes and stories without any direct implication to a devout Christian belief.

Secondly, an interesting topic for further investigation would be the parallel between the lives of the saints and religious literature that was pointed out but not thoroughly explored in this thesis. These two phenomena are already partly coinciding as an important part of Christian religious literature in some way describes or gives a glimpse to a religiously exemplary person's life. Not only the later popular genre of *vitae* of saints but also other traditions around some cultically important person, like the Enochic one, could be seen as, if not a *vita* in a strict sense, at least a manifestation of a similar phenomenon.

Lastly, I would like to underline the ecumenical potential of the inquiring approach to God-talk. Since we are here dealing with an approach that fundamentally shows respect for each community's inner logic and self-understanding as potential expressions of God's truth, an

external conflict between the different communities' habits is no disaster. As pointed out above in 2.1, conflicting virtues or teachings are closer to the form of truth that Hauerwas conceptualizes. This is, however, only true if the differences are accepted as parts of the same image of truth and that there is no way of representing the whole truth in some concluding form.

Swedish summary

Hur vårt liv omskriver vår Gud: En undersökning i Rewritten Bible som ett hermeneutiskt verktyg inom ramverket av Stanley Hauerwas narrativa etik

I den här avhandlingen för jag samman två koncept från olika fält inom den teologiska forskningen. Som det teoretiska ramverket har jag valt Stanley Hauerwas narrativa etik såsom den presenteras i hans bok *The Peaceable Kingdom: A Primer in Christian Ethics*. Det andra konceptet som jag ämnar integrera i det här ramverket härstammar i sin tur från bibelforskningen. Det handlar om den så kallade Rewritten Bible som lanserades av Geza Vermes på 1960-talet och har kommit att bli föremål för mycken debatt bland bibelforskare under åren. Även om både betydelsen av och relevansen för begreppet idag är högst oklara inom dess ursprungsfält, anser jag att det bland de nyaste förslagen finns bidrag som går att förena med det narrativa ramverket i Hauerwas etiska system. På det sättet skulle en viss förståelse av Rewritten Bible kunna fungera som ett verktyg för att närma sig de narrativ där Gud och hans bibliska berättelse aktualiseras i nya berättelser.

När man tar i beaktande det hauerwasianska ramverket, måste de återberättade berättelserna dock förstås i en bredare bemärkelse att inkludera även sådana uttryck för det religiösa narrativet som exempelvis livsgestaltning i en religionsgemenskap. Likaså förutsätter det valda ramverket att de undersökta berättelserna tas på allvar som representationer av Gud och därför måste inkluderas i diskursen om vad Gud är och hur man ska tala om honom. Eftersom det är den religiösa gemenskapens och dess medlemmars liv som för Hauerwas utgör den primära formen av Guds berättelse genom vilken han har valt att finnas i världen, blir dessa liv i själva verket en omskrivning av vem och vad Gud är. Den här omskrivningen kan även konstateras vara en väsentlig del av Gud själv och hans sanning vars mening förhandlas om och om igen när de olika omskrivningarna introduceras i dialog och debatt. En uppgift för den systematiska teologin i Hauerwas fotspår blir att hitta sätt att tala om Gud i enlighet med de implikationer som den här formen av Guds existens innebär.

För att konkretisera min poäng inkluderar jag ett fallstudium där jag tillämpar en Rewritten Bible-metodologi på en konkret text, den så kallade Djurapokalypsen i 1 Henoksboken. Djurapokalypsen innehåller en starkt ideologiserad redogörelse för Israels historia från världens

skapelse till Mackabeertiden som vidgas i slutet till att omfatta en apokalyptisk vision om Israels seger över sina fiender. En del av händelserna samstämmer således med de narrativ som kan hittas i den masoretiska texten som utgör den nuvarande bibliska kanonen för både judar och många kristna kyrkor. Därför passar texten utmärkt för syftet att demonstrera hur en analys av återberättade bibliska narrativ kan se ut. En särskild utmaning med en sådan analys uppstår när återberättelserna skiftar från litterära eller verbala formar till mera biografiska liksom Hauerwas Gudskoncept förutsätter. Då är det viktigt att vara medveten om den dialog som inleds när teologen analyserar sitt material. Det är dock viktigare för den systematiska teologins tal om Gud att blottlägga möjligheternas mångfald och den potential till kreativitet som den inrymmer än att rekonstruera de motiv och mål, eller ens strukturer, som finns bakom texten. På det viset kan även dialogen mellan teologen och materialet integreras i en kreativ teologisk process som kan göras fruktbar för att hitta nya sätt att tala Gud.

Syfte och ämnesmotivering

Syftet med avhandlingen är således att undersöka på vilket sätt bibliska narrativ som berättas utanför Bibeln själv i olika sammanhang skulle kunna analyseras och göras relevanta för den systematiska teologin. Huvudtanken är att hitta sätt att tala om Gud även inom akademin som kunde bättre förenas med Hauerwas narrativa koncept om Guds verklighet. Den systematiska teologins relevans blir ibland ifrågasatt inom den akademiska världen idag, och jag vill med min avhandling inleda ett bidrag till hur den skulle kunna gestaltas i nutiden.

Idag är mycket enligt min uppfattning präglat av parallella verkligheter som bärs upp av olika gemenskaper på olika nivåer. Det som kanske skiljer dagens situation från tidigare är att genom internet och sociala medier är de olika gemenskaperna allt mera medvetna om varandra. På det sättet utvecklas lätt även globala, virtuella sammanslutningar kring olika fenomen och livstolkningar som även kan få nästan militära etos omkring sig. Den ibland häftiga striden om sanningen som kan finnas gemenskaper emellan skulle gagnas av en inställning som inte automatiskt ogiltigförklarade de andras sanningar. I många fall är även de olika kristna gemenskaperna inkluderade i den här stridens dynamik och därför är inte de frågor som lett till förverkligandet av den här avhandlingen heller irrelevanta för ekumeniken. Jag anser att Hauerwas narrativa koncept erbjuder en väldigt användbar utgångspunkt för att närma sig sanningsfrågan utgående från ett gemenskapsperspektiv. Inom diskussionen kring Rewritten Bible finns i sin tur bidrag som ger verktyg för att närma sig både andras och de egna

berättelserna på ett respektfullt och öppet sätt. Den efterfrågande attityden som de här bidragen ger uttryck för möjliggör även en mer kreativ gestaltning av resultaten i narrativ form än några mer strukturella approacher. Till min kännedom finns det dessutom ingen tidigare forskning som skulle föra samman de specifika koncepten i Hauerwas narrativa etik och Rewritten Bible.

Metod, material och genomförande

De viktigaste metoderna jag använder mig av för avhandlingens konceptuella reflektioner är innehållslig begrepps- och idéanalys där jag genom närläsning identifierar centrala tematiska grundtoner i mitt material för att sedan relatera dem till varandra. På det sättet innebär analysen även explicit jämförelse mellan de respektive idékomplexen. Som huvudkällor har jag å ena sidan Hauerwas *The Peaceable Kingdom*, å andra sidan antologin *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Techniques? A Last Dialogue with Geza Vermes* (redigerad av József Zsengellér), den Åbo Akademi-anknutna SRB-publikationsserien, samt två monografier: *Early Modes of Exegesis: Ideal Figures in Malachi as a Test Case* av Lotta Valve och *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts* av Molly M. Zahn. Jag börjar min analys med att ge en analytisk överblick både över Hauerwas som det teoretiska ramverket och begreppet Rewritten Bible, dess historia och dess reception bland bibelforskare. Dessa överblickar utgör basen för att identifiera snittpunkter mellan de två koncepten vars kompatibilitet jag ämnar visa. Genom en djupare inblick i vissa tendenser i den vetenskapliga diskursen kring Rewritten Bible som följande steg lyfter jag fram hur dessa visar likheter till Hauerwas narrativa koncept.

I mitt fallstudium tillämpar jag en metodologi hämtad från Erkki Koskenniemi och Pekka Lindqvist. Koskenniemi och Lindqvists metodologi är specifikt utvecklad för att analysera texter som anses representera Rewritten Bible och den utgår från två steg: hur och varför texten är förändrad. Det första steget – hur? – uppmärksammar de konkreta skillnaderna mellan den återberättade texten och dess grundtext. Det andra steget – varför? – koncentrerar sig i sin tur på de motiv som författaren möjligen har eller inte har haft bakom sin ändrade version av den bibliska texten. De här två stegen applicerar jag på berättelsen om Noa i Djurapokalypsen i min hypotetiska jämförelse mellan den och den masoretiska versionen av Genesis 6–7. Konkret framskrider analysen genom att jämföra Djurapokalypsens narrativ med den masoretiska och identifiera möjliga orsaker för de skillnader som finns. Detta förverkligas med hjälp av sekundärlitteratur om Djurapokalypsen. Eftersom den här avhandlingen skrivs inom

systematisk teologi, har jag valt att använda mig av en allmänt accepterad engelsk översättning av båda texterna. På det sättet blir också avhandlingens längd hanterbar. Av praktiska skäl blir analysen även på andra sätt ytlig ur den historiska bibelforskningens synvinkel då den nästan helt förbiser bland annat sådana relevanta aspekter som språkfrågan och utvandringen av Djurapokalypsen från sin ursprungliga judiska kontext till en kristen. Ur ett systematiskteologiskt perspektiv räcker det däremot i min åsikt att vara medveten om de här realiteterna för att kunna greppa den komplexitet som alltid finns involverad när man analyserar reception av olika narrativ.

Resultat

I samband med min analys av konceptet Rewritten Bible i ljuset av Hauerwas narrativa etik kom jag fram till att den mest dominerande gemensamma aspekten i båda koncepten är auktoriteten som är involverad i de olika berättelsernas reception. Både Rewritten Bible-forskare och Hauerwas betonar lojaliteten hos den som återberättar ett bibliskt narrativ, vare sig i form av en text, bild, muntligt framförande, livsgestaltning eller annan. Det här perspektivet blir desto intressantare när den andra viktiga gemensamma faktorn som kunde identifieras mellan de två koncepten beaktas, nämligen återberättande och omskrivning som en form av omläsning. Att betrakta återberättaren som först och främst en recipient, en som läser texten eller mottar traditionen, sätter fokuset på det intuitiva och sociala i berättelsernas livs- och aktualiseringsprocesser hos individer och gemenskaper. Särskilt påtagligt bland Rewritten Bible-bidragen blir den här aspekten i Antti Laatos och George Brookes resonemang. Laato karaktäriserar Rewritten Bible som ”en referensvärld” och Brooke som ”ett sätt att se på världen”, vilket är i samklang med Hauerwas betoning på det intuitiva med den kristnas berättande av Guds berättelse genom sitt liv och sina livsval.

Ett problem som kan verka oöverkomligt med tanke på kompatibiliteten av de respektive koncepten är synen på den bibliska kanonen. Medan en sluten skriftlig kanon fungerar som en av grundstenarna för Hauerwas hela koncept om sanningen och Guds existens, finns det bland bibelforskare en allmän konsensus om att det inte fanns något sådant vid den tiden som fenomenet som senare kom att kallas Rewritten Bible uppkom. Vid närmare betraktelse visar det sig dock att skillnaderna snarare ligger i de olika utgångspunkterna hos de respektive författarna än i synen på hur förutsättningarna för återberättandet av bibliska berättelser förstås. Hauerwas etiska koncept är från början normativ och riktad från ett visst inifrånperspektiv till

kristna fromhetsgemenskaper. I detta sammanhang får de kanoniserade heliga texterna en viktig roll som en utgångspunkt och ett kriterium för dagens kristna att gestalta sitt liv enligt Guds berättelse. När det gäller Rewritten Bible strävar de diskuterade forskarna däremot efter en analytisk objektivitet i sina reflektioner och betraktar den bibliska kanonen som ett empiriskt faktum som antingen finns eller inte finns på bakgrunden i deras forskningsmaterial. Ändå visar båda sidorna en medvetenhet om den komplexitet som är inblandad i biblisk reception, vilket i Hauerwas fall demonstreras i hans betoning på gemenskapens traditioner och de heligas liv som ett slags positivt exempel för hur ett bibelbaserat liv kan levas. Således ser jag ingen egentlig motsägelse i att analysera hauerwasianskt bibelberättande som Rewritten Bible.

Det viktigaste resultatet som min analys av Djurapokalypsen bidrar till handlar om sättet att hantera återberättat bibliskt material som tal om, eller också annan representation av, Gud. Även om analysen av själva Djurapokalypsen blir ytlig som sådan, synliggör den ändå punkter och ställen där det är bra att stanna upp och fråga sig i vilken utsträckning det finns (o)medvetna motiv bakom skillnaderna mellan den återberättade texten och dess grundtext. Koskenniemi och Lindqvists metodologi är speciellt nyttig för det här ändamålet då den är starkt präglad av en viss metodologisk skepticism mot all slags generalisering av spekulationer. Av samma orsak anser jag även att just den här metodologin passar bra för att analysera återberättade berättelser i det hauerwasianska ramverket. Det viktiga med att betrakta livet, individen, och Gud som först och främst narrativa existenser ligger för Hauerwas i hans vilja att undvika alla slags absoluta och universella sanningar som gör både narrativet i sig och dess tolkande gemenskap mer eller mindre irrelevanta i slutändan. Att analysera den (åter)berättade Bibeln enligt Hauerwas premisser innebär följaktligen att inte så mycket visa några generaliserbara strukturer bakom narrativet som att föra de olika narrativen i diskussion med varandra. Samma logik måste enligt min uppfattning även gälla ett analogt tal om Gud som till grunden kan sägas utgöra åtminstone en fundamental uppgift för den systematiska teologin. För ett sådant närmandesätt anser jag att en efterfrågande och öppen inställning till de narrativ som finns omkring är av fördel.

Framtida forskning

Avhandlingens resonemang skulle i framtiden kunna tillämpas på konkreta analyser av bibliska narrativ utanför Bibeln. På det sättet skulle metodologin kunna utvecklas och nya tillgångar skulle kunna skapas till ärliga narrativa representationer av Gud. För det andra förtjänar

aspekten av de heligas liv hos Hauerwas en närmare uppmärksamhet. I avhandlingen föreslår jag en parallell mellan de heligas liv och den roll som religiös litteratur har i några Rewritten Bible-resonemang. Den här tematiken blir dock mer eller mindre i marginalen, men skulle vid närmare betraktelse kunna öppna upp nya perspektiv särskilt på den biografiska formen som Guds berättelse enligt Hauerwas kan ta. För det tredje anser jag att ett sådant närmandesätt till tal om Gud som den här avhandlingen pekar på har en stark ekumenisk potential. Hauerwas fokus på de olika kristna gemenskaperna som det främsta lokuset för berättandet av Guds berättelse ger utrymme för skillnader mellan de konkreta gemenskaperna. Desto starkare blir den här poängen i och med Hauerwas syn på sanning som en diskussion där motstridigheter på intet sätt är omöjliga eller ens oönskade. En sådan utgångspunkt ger bra förutsättningar för ett respektfullt bemötande och studien av de andras narrativ om Gud i Koskenniemi och Lindqvists fotspår.

Bibliography

Avi-Yonah, Michael. "History: The Aftermath of the First Roman War." *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, edited by Michael Berenbaum and Fred Skolnik, 2nd ed., vol. 9, Macmillan Reference USA, 2007, pp. 200-204.
Gale eBooks,
link.gale.com/apps/doc/CX2587509051/GVRL?u=oxford&sid=bookmark-GVRL&xid=1a12dfd7. Accessed 8 Oct. 2021.

Assefa, Daniel. 2007. *L'Apocalypse des Animaux (1 Hen 85-90): Une Propagande Militaire? – Approches Narrative, Historico-Critique, Perspectives Théologiques*. Leiden: Brill.

Barnes, William H. 2002. "Archangels." In: Metzger, Bruce M.; Coogan, Michael D. (eds.) *The Oxford Guide to People and Places in the Bible*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. E-book.

Brooke, George J. 2014. "Memory, Cultural Memory and Rewriting Scripture." In: Zsengellér, József (ed.) *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Techniques? A Last Dialogue with Geza Vermes*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Browning, W. R. F. 2009a. "Daniel, book of." In: *A Dictionary of the Bible*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Retrieved 26.12.2021, from https://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2460/view/10.1093/acref/9780199543984.001.0001/acref-9780199543984-e-485.

Browning, W. R. F. 2009b. "Tobit, book of." In: *A Dictionary of the Bible*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Retrieved 26.12.2021, from https://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2460/view/10.1093/acref/9780199543984.001.0001/acref-9780199543984-e-1930.

Campbell, Jonathan G. 2014. "Rewritten Bible: A Terminological Reassessment." In: Zsengellér, József (ed.) *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Techniques? A Last Dialogue with Geza Vermes*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Charles, R.H. 1912. *The Book of Enoch.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Dan, Joseph. 2007. "Sefer ha-Yashar." EJ 18. pp. 240-1. Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House Ltd.

Dillmann, August. 1853. *Das Buch Henoch*. Leipzig: Vogel.

Ego, Beate. 2005. "Vergangenheit im Horizont eschatologischer Hoffnung: Die Tiervision (1 Hen 85-90) als Beispiel apokalyptischer Geschichtskonzeption." In: Becker, Eve-Marie (ed.). *Die antike Historiographie und die Anfänge der christlichen Geschichtsschreibung*. BZNW 129. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Feldman, Louis H. 2013. "Josephus and His Writings." In: Feldman, Louis H. et al. (ed.). *Outside the Bible: Ancient Jewish Writings Related to Scripture*, vol. 1. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society.

Gilders, William K. 2009. "The Concept of Covenant in Jubilees." In: Boccaccini, Gabriele; Baba, Giovanni (eds.). *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Grand Rapids, Michigan/Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans.

Gore-Jones, Lydia. 2015. "Animals, Humans, Angels and God: Animal Symbolism in the Historiagraphy of the 'Animal Apocalypse' of 1 Enoch." JSP 24.4. pp. 268-287.

Grintz, Yehoshua M. 2007. "Enoch, The Ethiopic Book of." EJ 6. pp. 442-4. Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House Ltd.

Grossfeld, Bernard/Sperling, S. David. 2007. "Bible, Translations, Aramaic: the Targumim." EJ 3. pp. 588-595. Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House Ltd.

Hauerwas, Stanley. 1983. *The Peaceable Kingdom: A Primer in Christian Ethics*. Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.

Jacobson, Howard. 2013. “Pseudo-Philo, Book of Biblical Antiquities.” In: Feldman, Louis H. et al. (ed.). *Outside the Bible: Ancient Jewish Writings Related to Scripture*, vol. 1. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society.

Joseph, Simon J. 2013. “Was Daniel 7.13’s ‘Son of Man’ Modeled after the ‘New Adam’ of the *Animal Apocalypse* (*1 Enoch* 90)? A Comparative Study.” JSP 22.4 pp. 269-294.

Koskenniemi, Erkki; Lindqvist, Pekka. 2008. “Rewritten Bible, Rewritten Stories: Methodological Aspects.” In: Laato, Antti; van Ruiten, Jacques (eds.). *Rewritten Bible Reconsidered: Proceedings of the Conference in Karkku, Finland August 24-26 2006*. SRB 1. Turku & Winona Lake: Åbo Akademi University & Eisenbraun.

Kugel, James L. 2013. “Jubilees.” In: Feldman, Louis H. et al. (ed.). *Outside the Bible: Ancient Jewish Writings Related to Scripture*, vol. 1. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society.

Kugel, James L. 1999. *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible As It Was at the Start of the Common Era*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Laato, Antti. 2017. “Rewriting Israel’s History in the Apocalyptic Context: Animal Apocalypse in First Enoch.” SEÅ 82. pp. 28-51.

Laato, Antti. 2016. “The Chronology in the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch 85-90.” JSP 26.1. pp. 3-19.

Laato, Antti. 2010. “Gen 49:8-12 and Its Interpretation in Antiquity: A Methodological Approach to Understanding of the Rewritten Bible” In: Koskenniemi, Erkki; Lindqvist, Pekka (eds.). *Rewritten Biblical Figures*. SRB 3. Turku & Winona Lake: Åbo Akademi University & Eisenbraun.

Lindqvist, Pekka. 2011. *Juutalaisuus*. Tätä on Kristinusko. Kauniainen: Perussanoma.

Milik, Józef T. 1976. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Morgenstern, Matthew J.; Segal, Michael. 2013. “The Genesis Apocryphon.” In: Feldman, Louis H. et al. (ed.). *Outside the Bible: Ancient Jewish Writings Related to Scripture*, vol. 1. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society.

Nickelsburg, George W. E. 2001. *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 1-36; 81-108*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Olson, Daniel. 2013. *New Reading of the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch: “All Nations Shall be Blessed” / With a New Translation and Commentary*. SVTP 24. Leiden: Brill.

Petersen, Anders Klostergaard. 2014. “Textual Fidelity, Elaboration, Supersession or Encroachment? Typological Reflections on the Phenomenon of Rewritten Scripture.” In: Zsengellér, József (ed.). *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Techniques? A Last Dialogue with Geza Vermes*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Reese, Günter. 1999. *Die Geschichte Israels in der Auffassung des frühen Judentums: eine Untersuchung der Tiervision und der Zehnwochenapokalypse des äethiopischen Henochbuches, der Geschichtsdarstellung der Assumptio Mosis und der des 4Esrabuches*. BBB 123. Berlin: Philo.

Sacchi, Paolo. 1986. “Henochgestalt/Henochlitteratur.” TRE 15. pp. 42-54. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Sarna, Nahum M. 2007. “Enoch.” EJ 6. p. 441. Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House Ltd.

Schiffman, Lawrence H. 2013. “Temple Scroll.” In: Feldman, Louis H. et al. (ed.). *Outside the Bible: Ancient Jewish Writings Related to Scripture*, vol. 3. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society.

Schorch, Stefan. 2014. “Rewritten Bible and the Vocalization of the Biblical Text.” In: József Zsengellér (ed.). *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Techniques? A Last Dialogue with Geza Vermes*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Stern, Menahem. 2007. ”History: Ereẓ Israel – Second Temple.” In M. Berenbaum & F. Skolnik (Eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (2nd ed., Vol. 9, pp. 191-200). Macmillan Reference USA. https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/CX2587509049/GVRL?u=oxford&sid=bookmark-GVRL&xid=6bdc0a61

Stuckenbruck, Loren T. 2014. *The Myth of Rebellious Angels: A Study in Second Temple Judaism and New Testament Texts*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Tiller, Patrick A. 1993. *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch*. SBLEJL 4. Atlanta: Scholars.

Ulrich, Eugene. 2014. “Crossing Borders from ‘Pre-Scripture’ to Scripture (Rewritten) to ‘Rewritten Scripture.’” In: Zsengellér, József (ed.). *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Techniques? A Last Dialogue with Geza Vermes*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Valve, Lotta. 2014. *Early Modes of Exegesis: Ideal Figures in Malachi as a Test Case*. Turku: Åbo Akademi University Press.

VanderKam, James C. 2003. “Open and Closed Eyes in the Animal Apocalypse (*1 Enoch 85-90*).” In: Kugel, James L. (ed.). *Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel*. Leiden: Brill.

Venter, P. M. 2004. “Reviewing History in Apocalyptic Literature as Ideological Strategy.” HTS 60/3. pp. 703-23.

Venter, P. M. 1997. “Daniel and Enoch: Two Different Reactions.” HTS 53/1 & 2. pp. 68-91.

Vermes, Geza. 2014. “The Genesis of the Concept of ‘Rewritten Bible.’” In: Zsengellér, József (ed.). *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Techniques? A Last Dialogue with Geza Vermes*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Vermes, Geza. 1961. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism. Haggadic Studies*. Studia Post-Biblica 4. Leiden: Brill.

White Crawford, Sidnie. 2014. “Rewritten Scriptures as a Clue to Scribal Traditions in the Second Temple Period.” In: Zsengellér, József (ed.). *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Techniques? A Last Dialogue with Geza Vermes*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Yadin, Yigael. 2007. “Temple Scroll.” EJ 6. pp. 633-5. Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House Ltd.

Zahn, Molly M. 2011. *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.