Friend of God, Brother of Sarah, and Father of Isaac

Abraham in the Hebrew Bible and in Qumran

REINHARD G. KRATZ

It is not the aim of this essay to present another lexicon article which goes through the reception history of the Abraham tradition in post-biblical Jewish and Christian literature passage by passage. There is enough of that.[1] Rather, what interests me and has not, as far as I can see, been investigated very often, is the question how this reception history relates to the history of the Abraham tradition in the Hebrew Bible itself. The question implies that the composition of the patriarchal narratives in Genesis as well as the references to Abraham in other biblical writings as such is already a process of reception, which can be designated as inner-biblical interpretation distinct from interpretation or exegesis in the reception outside the Bible.

As there was not yet a Hebrew Bible in the pre-Christian period, our starting point will have to be that in principle there is no distinction between inner- and extra-biblical interpretations.[2] However, in the case of the book of Genesis we have to consider that the interpretation takes place in the formation of the book itself. By contrast, extra-biblical interpretation presupposes the biblical tradition as a reference text, and like the mention of Abraham in other biblical writings, creates something new. It is obvious that the authoritative character of the biblical tradition increases to the degree that other literature refers to it. This mechanism raises all the more the question of the relationship between the two modes of interpretation.

Along these lines, in what follows I shall limit myself to the Dead Sea Scrolls and their relationship to exegesis within the Hebrew Bible.[3] Here, I shall investigate three examples of this relationship: 1. Abraham, the friend of God, 2. Abraham, the brother of Sarah, and 3. Abraham, the father of Isaac.

---

[1] See e.g. SARNA 1971; EVANS 2000; MILLARD 1992; MARTIN-ACHARD 1977; VERMES 1983, 67–126.

[2] See KRATZ 2006, 126–156, 157–180.

[3] For a survey of the material see BERNSTEIN 1998.

1. Abraham, the friend of God

In the Damascus Document CD III:2–3, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are mentioned as examples of obedience to God's commandments and for this reason are called "friends of God":

אברהם לא הלך בה ויע[ל או]חב בשמרו מצות אל ולא בחר ברצון רוחו
וימסור לישחק וליעקב וישמרו ויכתבו אוהבים לאל ובעלי ברית לעולם

Abraham did not walk therein (viz. in hardness of heart) and is thought of as a friend because he observed God's commandments and did not choose the will of his own spirit. And he handed (them) on to Isaac and Jacob, and they preserved (them) and were written down as friends of God and lords of the covenant for ever.

Both the title "friend of God" (אוהב לאל) and its association with obedience to the law are often attested in the Jewish and the Christian tradition and have also found their way into the Islamic tradition.[4] Here, CD III:2–3 is of particular interest.

Among all the relevant references CD III is one of the earliest passages that refer to the title, which is attested for the first time in the Hebrew Bible in Isa. 41:8 and 2 Chron. 20:7. The passage in CD has its closest parallel in Jub. 19:9 and 30:20–21 and seems to presuppose the book of Jubilees.[5] Both compositions have two things in common. First, the title "friend of God" is explicitly transferred to others. Significantly, in Jubilees it is Levi who, like Abraham "is written on the tablets of heaven" as "friend and righteous man".[6] The parallel explains the motif that Abraham and his descendants are "written down", which appears without the "tablets of heaven" in CD III:4 and here too gives an eschatological meaning to the title.

---

[4] See OEGEMA 1999, 139–165. He is treating the following references: Isa. 41:8; 2 Chron. 20:7; Dan. 3:34–36 LXX; Jub. 19:9; CD III:1–4; Ws 7:27; Philo, De Sobrietate 10:56; De Migratione Abrahami 9:44–45; ApocAbr (Slav.) 9:6; 10:6; TestAbr (Greek) 1:1; 2:2; 8:2; Mishnah Aboth 5:13, 19; 6:1; Sifre Numeri §§ 42 und 115; Midrash Rabbah 44:3; James 2:23. The information for TestAbr depends on the edition (or manuscripts); ALLISON 2003, 77, gives the following list: 2:3, 6; 4:7; 8:2, 4; 9:7; 15:12–14; 16:5, 9; 20:14 of the Long Recension, and 4:10; 8:2; 14:6 of the Short Recension. Furthermore, there have to be added Isa. 51:2 LXX and two, maybe three references from Qumran: 4Q176 1–2 i:10 (quotation of Isa. 41:8); 4Q252 ii:8; and maybe also 4Q225 2 ii:10 (see below n. 50). For the early Christian reception see 1Clem. 10:1; 17:2; for the Islamic tradition in the Qur'an surah 4:125.

[5] Elsewhere, too, CD shows itself to be influenced by the Book of Jubilees and seems to refer to it explicitly in CD XVI:3–4 (see also III:14).

[6] The genealogy of the patriarchs is also cited as far as Levi in 4Q225 2 ii:11 and 4Q226 7:5 (both Ps-Jub.). See also 4Q542 (TQahat ar) 1 i:8, 11; 5Q13 2:5–8 and 4Q379 17:4–5 (three patriarchs, Moses, Eleazar and Ithamar).

Second, in both writings, the book of Jubilees and the Damascus Document, the title "friend of God" is combined with certain passages of the patriarchal story in the Book of Genesis. In Jubilees the "faith" and "righteousness" of Abraham (Gen. 15:6) is the reason for the bestowing of the title (see also Jub. 17:18). Both "faith" and "righteousness" includes obedience to the law.[7] For the Damascus Document this is the starting point for explicitly identifying the "friend of God" with the very one who preserves and hands down God's commandments. It is the Abraham of the book of Jubilees whom the Damascus Document has in view.

By contrast the biblical references are somewhat hidden in CD. They appear in the ideal of the להתהלך תמים (CD II:15), to whom Abraham was the first to correspond: אברהם לא הלך בה (CD III:2). This is an allusion to the covenant with Abraham in Genesis 17 (v. 1), which also stands in the background in CD XII:11 and XVI:6. This covenant clearly calls for obedience to the law. CD III:3–4 adds the honorary title "friend of God". The result is a combination of love and obedience to the law, which also implies an eschatological future for those who love God and keep his law.

Furthermore, the passage in CD III is of particular significance within the corpus of writings from Qumran. Certainly Abraham and the other patriarchs are represented numerous times in the Dead Sea Scrolls.[8] But the picture differs when we take the difference between Qumranic and non-Qumranic origin and the genre into account.[9] It is striking that in contrast to the earlier Rule of Community (1QS), only here in CD is the life of the community put in the context of the biblical history. The Damascus Document thus proves to be a kind of key text, which formulates the hermeneutical framework for the reception and reworking of the biblical and non-biblical Abraham tradition within the Qumran community itself.

Two further texts which mention Abraham as a "friend of God" attest this preoccupation with his figure in the Qumran texts. One, 4Q176 (4QTanhumim) 1–2 i:10, is a quotation of Isa. 41:8, the other, 4Q252 (which used to be cited as "4QPatriarchal Blessings", but now is cited as

---

[7] Similarly in the testament of Mattathias in 1 Macc. 2:49–68 (esp. v. 52, the combination of Genesis 15 and 22) and in Sir 44:19–21; see below under 3.

[8] See the Concordance of Proper Names in TOV 2002. References which cannot be dealt with because the text has been badly preserved are: 4Q299 106:2; 4Q302 1 i:7; 4Q464 3 i:6; 5Q22 1:5; 11Q12 11:2.

[9] As far as I can see, one can distinguish three groups: 1. Texts which – like Jubilees – themselves rework the Abraham material and belong to the genre of the *rewritten Bible* in the broadest sense: 1QapGen; 4Q158; 4Q196; 4Q214b; 4Q225; 4Q226; 4Q252; 4Q364; 4Q464; 4Q542 (and 11Q12); 2. Texts which – like the prayer of Azariah – in the course of reworking other biblical material recall Abraham and the other patriarchs: 4Q176; 4Q378; 4Q379; 4Q385a; 4Q389; 3. Texts which – like the Damascus Document – deal with the Qumran community itself: CD; 4Q393 (4Q299; 4Q302; 5Q13).

4QpGen[a] or 4QCommentary on Genesis A), seems to allude to 2 Chron. 20:7.[10] Here, the Commentary on Genesis (4Q252) is of particular interest. This text adds another relevant biblical passage in combination with the title "friend of God". It combines Genesis 15, the "faith" of Abraham, with the Aqeda in Genesis 22. Thus, in the early reception of the biblical title "friend of God" taken from Isa. 41:8 or 2 Chron. 20:7 the title is almost always related to certain topics of the biblical Abraham tradition: to the faith and righteousness of Abraham (Genesis 15), the covenant with Abraham (Genesis 15 and 17), and the fear of God that is proved within several temptations of Abraham (Genesis 15 and 20). All these topics as well as the title itself are related to the observance of the law.

Let us now turn to the biblical references to the "friend of God". The interpretation of the title in the book of Jubilees or in the Damascus Document and the other Qumran writings apparently does not have much in common with them. But on closer inspection the biblical references and their reception are not very far removed.

The title occurs for the first time in Isa. 41:8 within the oracle of salvation to Jacob-Israel in Isa. 41:8–13. The clumsiness of the syntax suggests that vv. 8b, 9a are an addition: "seed of Abraham my friend" (זֶרַע אַבְרָהָם אֹהֲבִי) in v. 8b duplicates the address of Israel and Jacob, the adjoining relative clause in v. 9a duplicates the אשר-clause in v. 8a. Both syntactically and in context it is far from clear whether the statement is to be related to the descendants of Abraham (Jacob-Israel) or to Abraham himself. But even if the verses should be original, they represent an incidental remark that expands the usual form of the address. However, there seems good reason for having added the expansion at this point within the Book of Isaiah. Isa. 41:8–13 is the first of four oracles of salvation to the people addressed as the patriarch Jacob-Israel (41:14–16; 43:1–7; 44:1–5). After the oracles in Isaiah 40, which are centred on the threatened position of Jacob-Israel under the nations (40:27) and refer to the creator of the world, this passage is meant to draw out the line of patriarchs to their progenitor Abraham. Several inter-textual connections underline this aim. Thus, just as God has created "the ends of the earth" (40:28) and has called one before whom "the ends of the earth" will quake (41:5), so too he has called Abraham "from the ends of the earth" and thus already done to him what he promises to do again to the descendants of Abraham.[11] On the basis of the addition and the inter-textual connections within Isaiah 40–41 that it

[10] For 4Q176 see ALLEGRO 1968; STANLEY 1992; HØGENHAVEN 2007. For 4Q252 see below under 3. The reading אוהבו in this text was disputed but is now consensus. See LIM 1992, 294–295; JACOBSON 1993a, 119; LIM 1993, 123; JACOBSON 1993b, 292 (where he misunderstood Lim's Notes), and finally BROOKE 1996, 198–199.

[11] See KRATZ 1991a, 43–47, 153–157, 161–163.

provides, it is not surprising that the Targum even went a step further and identified the one who is called in Isa. 41:1–17 with Abraham.

The second reference is 2 Chron. 20:7, a prayer of King Jehoshaphat, which must be dependent in literary terms on Isa. 41:8.[12] Isaiah 41 is here combined with the promise of possession of the land from Gen. 15:18 (לְזַרְעֲךָ נָתַתִּי אֶת־הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת) and Gen. 17:8 (לְאֲחֻזַּת ... נָתַתִּי לְךָ וּלְזַרְעֲךָ עוֹלָם). The common motive in this combination of texts is the threat from outside: by nameless enemies who wage war against Israel in Isa. 41:8–13; by the surrounding peoples (Ammonites, Moabites, etc.) in 2 Chronicles 20; by the peoples of the land in Genesis 15. In addition the depiction of the holy war in 2 Chronicles 20 is characterized by repeated allusions to the book of Isaiah. It therefore seems to be no coincidence that the passage Isa. 41:8 and the designation of Abraham as "friend of God" appear precisely here. The oracle of salvation in Isa. 41:8 (2 Chron. 20:7) goes perfectly together with the "God with us" from Isa. 7:14; 8:9–10 (2 Chron. 20:17; see also Isa. 41:10) and the admonition from Isa. 7:9 (2 Chron. 20:20) which concludes the oracle of salvation to Ahaz in Isa. 7:4–9. All this fits the genre of the holy war and the depiction of Jehoshaphat in Chronicles.[13] Thus by way of its transference to the people in Isaiah 40–44, the old genre (the prophetic oracle of salvation addressed to the king) regains its original *Sitz im Leben* in the Chronistic literature but is put on a new foundation: the promises to Abraham and his descendants.

Both passages, Isa. 41:8 and 2 Chron. 20:7, bear witness to the increasing significance of the progenitor Abraham in the Hebrew Bible that continues in the non-biblical literature of the Second Temple period.[14] As we shall see, this tendency is already indicated in the history of the composition of the Abraham tradition in Genesis. But in none of these biblical references is Abraham explicitly connected with the law, as he is in the book of Jubilees or the Damascus Document.[15] Not explicitly, but perhaps implicitly?

---

[12] The dependence is shown by the almost synonymous formulation לְזֶרַע אַבְרָהָם אֹהֲבֶךָ.

[13] See STRÜBIND 1991, 176–188.

[14] In the Deuteronomistic literature and passages dependent on it, the reminiscence of the three patriarchs dominates: Exod. 3:6, 15, 16; 4:5; 32:13; 33:1; Deut. 1:8; 6:10; 9:5, 27; 29:12; 30:20; 34:4; 1 Chron. 29:18; 2 Chron. 30:6. However, some very late passages are focussed on Abraham: Josh. 24:2–3; 1 Chronicles 1; 16 (in the quotation from Psalm 105); 2 Chron. 20:7; Neh. 9:7–8; Ps. 47:10; 105:6. This development goes hand in hand with the rise of Abraham in the prophetic literature, especially in the book of Isaiah: Isa. 29:22; 41:8–9; 51:2 (see also LXX!); 63:16; Jer. 33:26; Ezek. 33:24; Mic. 7:20.

[15] In Jewish tradition this became the main meaning of the title; see Aboth 6:1. It must also have had an influence on James 2:23 where Gen. 15:6 and Isa. 41:8 are combined. This meaning, of course, fits with the picture of Abraham in the late layers of Genesis.

The usual rendering of the expression "friend of God" suggests a mutual relationship of affection and easily allows us to lose sight of the fact that in the Hebrew, according to the Masoretic vocalization, there is an active participle. The subject of this participle is not God but Abraham or the seed of Abraham (see 2 Chron. 20:7), who "loves him" or – as in the prayer – "loves you", i.e. God.[16] The usual understanding as "friend of God" is stimulated by the Greek versions. Thus in the Greek translation (LXX) of Isa. 41:8 und 2 Chron. 20:7 as well as in Dan. 3:35 the title is rendered with a form of the verb ἀγαπάω, usually in the passive, but in Isa. 41:8 and also in the addition of Isa. 51:2 LXX in the active with God as subject. Otherwise the expression φίλος τοῦ θεοῦ, Latin *dei amicus* (Jth. 8:22 V), is used. All three possibilities occur in the rendering of Isa. 41:8 LXX: ὃν ἠγάπησα (whom I love), Aquila: ἀγαπητοῦ σου (His beloved), Symmachus: τοῦ φίλου μου (my friend).[17]

However, things are completely different when one takes the Masoretic text and the regular Hebrew grammar into account.[18] With the active parti-

---

See EGO 1996. However, besides this meaning two other interpretations of the title also became influental. In the Prayer of Azariah Dan. 3:35 LXX the three patriarchs are regarded as bearers of the promise, which corresponds to the scene in Daniel 3 and the genre of the prayer, but at the same time is the basis for a tradition which has found wide acceptance, above all in the New Testament – without use of the title. In Ws 7:27 the title is generalized and related to all pious souls in which wisdom dwells.

[16] See JENNI 1971, 71.

[17] See OEGEMA 1999, 140–142. The Greek translation might be inspired by the notion of ידיד that is rendered with the passive form of ἀγαπάω (Deut. 33:12; Isa. 5:1) and was even found in the word יהיד of Gen. 22:2, 12, 16, and Prov. 4:3; see HALPERN-AMARU 2006. The Ethiopic variant in Jub. 17:12, 18; 19:9; and 30:20 also tends to the meaning "friend of God".

[18] The proposal to read a passive participle in BHS on Isa. 41:8 follows the Greek and Latin translators, who evidently did not understand, or did not want to understand, the construction. The rendering of the comparable construction in Isa. 48:14 also shows that the translators had difficulties with it. Here in the Hebrew Yhwh is the subject of the finite verb and the beloved, i.e. the object of this verb, the subject of the whole sentence (יְהוָה אֲהֵבוֹ יַעֲשֶׂה "him whom Yhwh loves, he will lead out"). However, the Greek translators omitted the name of God or did not find it there, and made the subject of the sentence here also the subject of the participle (ἀγαπῶν σε ἐποίησα). This change is in no way connected with the text-critical problem, whether the whole clause v. 14b is a later gloss or there is a miswriting of *yod* und *waw* – it may be that the unusual construction יהוה אהבו resulted in an assimilation of the suffixes in חֶפְצוֹ and וּזְרֹעוֹ; or that the one who miswrote the suffixes in חֶפְצוֹ and וּזְרֹעוֹ (in order to avoid misunderstandings about whose will and arm it was) added the divine name Yhwh as subject of the whole sentence and in assimilation to 2 Sam. 12:24 made a lover (אהבי) into a beloved of Yhwh (יהוה אהבו). The Greek translators deviate from every conceivable possibility by altering the suffixes into the second person singular throughout the first half of the sentence (ἀγαπῶν σε ἐποίησα τὸ θέλημά σου) and in the second half reading זְרֹעוֹ instead of וּזְרֹעוֹ and re-

ciple אוהב (loving) we are moving in a semantic field which very clearly belongs in the sphere of the law tradition. In distinction from the love of Yhwh for his people the love of human beings for Yhwh is attested exclusively in the context of legal admonition: in the Decalogue as well as in Deuteronomy, starting from the *shema' Israel* in Deut. 6:4–5.[19] Put in the right order, the *shema' Israel* stands at the beginning, followed by the Decalogue and the interpretations of both in Deuteronomy and other passages of the Hebrew Bible which are in turn dependent on it.[20]

The traditio-historical background, too, points in the same direction. As has long been known, the background of the notion of "love" is the Aramaic and Neo-Assyrian treaty, which influenced the formulation of the covenant theology of the Hebrew Bible.[21] Thus the strange-sounding, indeed moving, mixture of inward drive ("love") and external compulsion through the threat of sanctions (curse and blessing) is not to be explained from a subjective religious feeling but from the language of ancient Near Eastern diplomacy, though we should not deny a priori the seriousness of the emotions. Even a declaration of love like that of Barrakib of Ja'udi/Sam'al to the Assyrian Great King in the memorial stele for his own father, Panamuwa II, cannot simply be dismissed as pure flattery or calculated pragmatism.[22] It too is the expression of an identity preserved over generations, which has not only ensured the survival of the dynasty and kingdom but has also given inner support and orientation to the people of Ja'udi/Sam'al. Here feeling and pragmatism are by no means mutually exclusive.[23]

---

solving the "almost intolerably short" (DILLMANN 1882, 426) mode of expression וְזֶרַע כָּשְׂדִּים into a genitive absolute: τοῦ ἄραι σπέρμα Χαλδαίων.

[19] For the Decalogue see Exod. 20:6 // Deut. 5:10 and Deut. 7:9; Judg. 5:31; Dan. 9:4; Neh. 1:5; Ps. 145:20. For the Deuteronomy see Deut. 6:5; 10:12; 11:1, 13, 22; 13:4; 19:9; 30:6, 16, 20; also Josh. 22:5; 23:11; 1 Kings 3:3, and SPIECKERMANN 2000; RÜTERSWÖRDEN 2006.

[20] See KRATZ 2005a; AURELIUS 2003.

[21] See MORAN 1963; RÜTERSWÖRDEN 2006, and the other contributions to this subject in the same volume, 279–406. The traditio-historical background should not be overestimated (SPIECKERMANN 2000, 193 n. 8) and does not contribute anything to the absolute dating (RÜTERSWÖRDEN 2006, 230, 237). Nevertheless, the tradition is present, regardless of how one explains the transmission. On this question see KOCH 2006.

[22] See KAI 215 and for the historical context KRATZ 2007, 298–301.

[23] The same is true of a marriage between husband and wife which has been arranged or concluded on certain external conditions. This is why I am somewhat sceptical about the development in the "history of mentality" proposed by RÜTERWÖRDEN 2006, 232–233 in respect of Prov. 30:18–19 und Song of Songs 8:6–7. But there is no doubt at all that "inwardness assumes increasing importance" within the theological discourse of Deuteronomy (ibid., 233).

In Deuteronomy, the relationship between the vassal and the Great King has been transferred to the relationship between the people of Israel and its God. In the course of this, the love of the people for its God which was demanded and given of its own volition now also met with the love of its God in return. It is not just the people but Yhwh himself who have shown commitment in love to each other – this too is a relic of the ideology of ancient Near Eastern kingship.[24] So it is no coincidence that the love of God for his people in Deuteronomy is always connected with the election of the people.[25] The revision of Deuteronomy from the perspective of love is due to countless updatings and has led to considerable expansions above all in Deuteronomy 1–11. As in the Damascus Document, here too the law has been incorporated into the biblical history at a fairly late stage.[26] So here too "love" serves not least to combine the patriarchs with the law.

That brings us back to our "friend", Abraham, who loves God. Against the background indicated, it is not surprising that the designation "friend of God" occurs particularly in the genre of the oracle of salvation. Like the terminology of "love", this genre, too, is rooted in the ideology of kingship. The notion of the election of the king, or here of the people, to be "servant" of God has its original *Sitz im Leben* in the oracle of salvation. And where there is election, love is not far away. However, in Isa. 41:8–9 it is not the love of God for his people that goes with the election terminology. There is also an example of this combination in the oracles of salvation in the book of Isaiah (Isa. 43:4). But here, in Isa. 41:8, it is the love of Abraham (or his seed) for his God who has brought Abraham and its seed and called him, i.e. elected him, from the ends of the earth.

Thus while there is no explicit reference to Abraham's obedience to the law in Isa. 41:8–9, if the addition was not already meant in this sense, one could immediately understand the passage in this way from the perspective of the book of Jubilees and its version of the biblical story of Abraham and from the perspective of the Qumran community. The few passages in which there is a reference to the Torah in the book of Isaiah, and especially the text about the chosen servant of God in Isa. 42:1–4, in which Jacob-Israel has been found (see 49:3), must have made a further contribution to

[24] See 2 Sam. 12:24 and JENNI 1971, 70. The best examples are the Neo-Assyrian prophecies, which are mostly oracles of salvation.

[25] See Deut. 4:37; 7:7–8, 13; 23:6, and JENNI 1971, 70 as well as the literature mentioned above at n. 21. The love of God for his people, which found its way into Deuteronomy only at a relatively late stage, but is supposed to precede the love of the people for its God, is perhaps the most decisive motive which gives a new, heightened intensity in Deuteronomy to the love of God – in contrast to the notion of the treaty in the ancient Near East.

[26] See KRATZ 2005b, 114–133 (2000, 118–138).

this understanding.[27] And as the love in Isa. 41:8–9 has either Abraham or his seed as subject, in the further history of exegesis it could easily be transferred to all three patriarchs and their descendants.

It is the same with the adoption of Isa. 41:8–9 in 2 Chron. 20:7. Here too the closer context, the Jehoshaphat pericope, suggests that in the case of Abraham's love for his God we are to think of the fulfilment of God's will in the law. In Chronicles it is King Jehoshaphat in particular who – in a way comparable to the commission of the Persian king in Ezra 7 – argues for the Torah and its observance in Judah (2 Chron. 17:3–9) and reorganizes the law by the criteria of Deuteronomy 16–17 (2 Chron. 19:4–11).[28] Moreover, the fact that in his governance Jehoshaphat keeps the enemies of Judah at bay (2 Chron. 17:10–13) indicates a connection between the observance of the law and political and military success against the peoples of the land. In 2 Chronicles 20, Abraham, the "friend of God", can stand for both the observance of the law and separation from the people of the land, and with both the Damascus Document found an appropriate point of contact for citing Abraham and his sons as examples and designating them "friends of God". It seems that there is a trace leading directly from the reception of the figure of Abraham within the Bible to the tradition of exegesis in Qumran and beyond.

2. Abraham, Sarah's brother

The "friend of God" is of course only a slim trace and one which does not begin with the Abraham tradition itself but only in the reception in the Bible outside Genesis. The real test case of the relationship between the two modes of inner- and extra-biblical interpretation is a comparison of the composition of the Abraham tradition in Genesis with its reception outside the Bible. For this reason we shall turn next to an example which already had a long tradition history in Genesis itself before it was taken up in the Aramaic Genesis Apocryphon and in the book of Jubilees and expounded further: the narrative of the endangering of the ancestress.[29]

Here too it is useful to begin with the interpretations outside the Bible which presuppose the – more or less finished – biblical text. The interpretations faced the problem that the story of the temporary loss of the patriarch's wife, which endangers their descendants and thus the fulfilment of

[27] See Isa. 1:10; 2:3; 5:24; 8:16, 20; 24:5; 30:9; 42:4, 21, 24; 51:4, 7. The combination of Abraham and Torah in Isa. 41:8 and 42:1–4 is echoed in Isa. 51:2 and 51:4, 7. Therefore, it seems to be no coincidence that the LXX added the love (of God!) in 51:2.

[28] See KRATZ 1991b.

[29] See OSSWALD 1960; KÖCKERT 2006; NICKELSBURG 1998.

the divine promise, is narrated three times in Genesis: twice of Abraham and Sarah (Gen. 12:10–20; 20:1–18) and once of Isaac and Rebecca (Gen. 26:1–14). Above all the duplication in the case of Abraham raised questions and led to two kinds of reaction. The book of Jubilees mentions – very briefly – only the episode of Genesis 12 (Jub. 13:11–15) and passes over the repetitions in Genesis 20 (Jub. 16:10–12) and Genesis 26 (Jub. 24:12–13), not least because the subject did not fit the concept in terms of content and probably also of morality. The Aramaic Genesis Apocryphon is quite different.[30] We do not know whether it contained all three versions, since the extant parts of the work comprise only the material of Genesis 5–15. But the first version, Genesis 12, has been handed on and is given broad treatment in contrast to the book of Jubilees.

The narrative fills two columns (XIX–XX) and belongs to the first-person reports in the Genesis Apocryphon.[31] The framework of the narrative essentially follows the biblical model in Genesis 12: During a famine Abraham goes to Egypt and there makes Sarah pretend that she is his sister so as to save him from death. When Sarah's beauty is noted in Egypt, she is brought into Pharaoh's palace and Abraham is spared. But God smites Pharaoh's household with severe plagues, so that he recognizes the situation and gives Sarah back to Abraham. In addition to this the Apocryphon contains a wealth of narrative features which draw on the biblical parallel in Genesis 20 or have been added. Thus the additions arise either from the exegetical combination or the tradition or both.

The features which the Apocryphon draws from Genesis 20 are the following: the combination of Gen. 12:12 with Gen. 20:13 in XIX:19–20;[32] the nature of the plagues in Gen. 12:17, a universal impotence in the land of Egypt, which is inferred from Gen. 20:6, 17–18, in XX:16–17; the associated motif that Pharaoh has not approached Sarah from Gen. 20:4, 6 in XX:17–18; the revelation of the situation in a dream from Gen. 20:3 in

[30] Regarding the text in question (cols. XIX–XX) the revised, third edition of FITZMYER 2004, will do. For other editions and a few crucial readings see QIMRON 1992; for recent discussion and bibliography ZIEMER 2005, 27–69; for the mode of interpretation BERNSTEIN 1996; IDEM 1998, 145–150.

[31] Cols. II–V (Lamech); VI–XII and XII–XV (Noah); XIX–XXI:23 (Abraham); by contrast, in XVI–XVII (Genesis 10) and XXI:24–XXII:34 (Genesis 14–15) we find a narrative in the third person. Possibly the Apocryphon is composed of different sources, which also differ in proximity and distance as well as in style from the biblical tradition; the rendering of Genesis 14–15 in XXI:24–XXII:34 is closest to it. The combination of first-person and third-person style seems to have come about through superscriptions or subscriptions like the title "Book of the Words of Noah" preserved in V:27.

[32] See XIX:19–20: "...who will seek to kill me und to spare you (Gen. 12:12). [B]ut this is all the favor [that you must do for me]: Whe[rev]er [we shall be, say] about me 'He is my brother' (Gen. 20:13). Then I will live with your help and my life will be saved because of you (Gen. 12:13)."

XX:22 and the healing intercession from Gen. 20:7, 17 in XX:21–23, 28–29 (cf. XX:23 with Gen. 20:7); the mention and identification of the kingdom (provinces) of Egypt in the dispute from Gen. 20:9 in XX:26–28; Pharaoh's rehabilitation of Sarah from Gen. 20:16 in XX:30–31. After all, "with its version of the narrative of the ancestress the Genesis Apocryphon ... evidently stands closer to Gen 20 than to Gen 12".[33] That makes all the more important the omissions of certain narrative features, for instance the assertion of the innocence of the king in the face of God (Gen. 20:4–5) and Abraham (Gen. 20:9), the king's reproach that Abraham has brought injustice upon him and his kingdom (Gen. 20:9), the motif of the fear of God in a foreign land (Gen. 20:11), the explicit justification of Abraham by the explanation of the kinship relations (Gen. 20:12) or the permission to stay in the foreign land (Gen. 20:15). Omission, too, is a means of interpretation.

In addition, of course the features which go beyond both biblical versions and were added with or without support from them are of particular interest. First of these is the dream of the date palm and the cedar in XIX:14–18, which Abraham has immediately after crossing the Egyptian frontier. It replaces the dream of the foreign king, Abimelech, in Gen. 20:6 and has been inserted in order first to attribute an act of Abraham which is tricky and was perhaps felt to be offensive (cf. Gen. 20:9) to divine inspiration, and secondly to justify it with a reference to the common root (cf. Gen. 20:12). The discovery of Sarah's beauty (Gen. 12:11, 14–15) is elaborated broadly by the learned discussion of the court officials with Abraham about the books of Enoch and their extended description of Sarah's beauty and wisdom to the Pharaoh in the Apocryphon, XIX:23–XX:8; above all, it is supplemented with the new emphasis on the wisdom of Abraham and Sarah. Further additions are: Abraham's weeping and his prayer in XX:10–16, which have no basis in the biblical original but reinforce the motif that Sarah has been snatched away from Abraham by force; the heightening of the plagues and the vain attempt of the magicians of Egypt to master them; the negotiation between Lot and the court officials, who inform the king in XX:18–26 (cf. Gen. 20:8); and of course the attention to Lot himself in XX:11, 22, 34 and – with a view to Genesis 16 – of Hagar, into whose possession Sarah is said to have come on this occasion, in XX:32.

These are the major deviations and additions of the Genesis Apocryphon in comparison with the biblical version of Genesis 12 and 20. If we attempt to sort out the wealth of these changes and enquire into the motives, we can make out at least three purposes. First, these are exegetical explanations of open questions which arise from the text in Genesis 12 and

[33] KÖCKERT 2006, 165.

its relationship to Genesis 20, and the adornment of motifs which are discernible in the biblical original but have not been developed. Thus for example only the description of Sarah makes it clear what "beautiful" (יפה, יפת מראה) in Gen. 12:11, 14 actually means: physically immaculate from head to foot, but also shrewd. Secondly, the couple is to be acquitted of any suspicion of moral and physical impurity. Hence the dream which exculpates Abraham, and hence the emphasis on Sarah's integrity both in Abraham's prayer (XX:15) and through heightening of the plagues with which already according to Gen. 20:6 God prevents Pharaoh (who is said in Gen. 12:19 to have taken Sarah as his wife) from approaching her. Conversely, all the positive features of the foreign king, who according to Genesis 20 has acted in love and innocence, are omitted. Thirdly and finally, in this exegesis of the narrative another picture of Abraham is drawn. Probably occasioned by Gen. 20:7, where Abraham is designated "prophet", in the Apocryphon he is described as the type of the wise man with mantic and magical gifts which appears especially in the Joseph narrative and the Daniel legends (Daniel 1–6).[34] Like Joseph and Daniel, he has the capacity to receive and interpret dreams. Like Moses and Daniel he is in a position to compete with the professional magicians in Egypt or Babylonia and to beat them. And in addition – like the Abraham of the book of Jubilees (12:27) – he is skilled in the writings of Enoch, with which he impresses the wise men of Egypt, as Sarah does with her wisdom. In short, the Abraham of the Genesis Apocryphon is an ideal moral and intellectual figure. As Israel's ancestor he anticipates much that in the biblical narrative distinguishes the descendants of Israel. At the same time the ideal corresponds to the notions of Judaism in the Hellenistic period which, while moving and knowing how to move in the world of the great cultural nations, does not surrender anything of its integrity and identity.

If we compare this version of the narrative with the three variants in Genesis, as we already saw, it is closest to the version of Genesis 20. It seems that the Apocryphon takes its starting point especially from this version of the story. Dreams and extended dialogues occur in both versions. The narrative is concerned with Abraham's innocence and Sarah's integrity. Finally a picture of Abraham is drawn which is to root later Jewish tradition of prophets or sages in the figure with whom Israel began.

However, different accents are also set alongside this. As emerges not least from a comparison of the two biblical variants, Genesis 12 and 20, the latter already wants to present "Abraham as the model of a Judaism

[34] See KÖCKERT 2006, 166–167.

open to the world in the Diaspora".[35] Certainly, no doubt is left that Abraham and Sarah are different from their environment and want to remain different. But here it is the foreign king who keeps the law.[36] It is evident that the description of the foreign king, Abimelech of Gerar, draws a picture of a foreign land which is quite positive and open towards Judaism as long as it also respects the interests of that land. Thus Abimelech addresses the God of Abraham as "my Lord" and is concerned for his innocence before this God (Gen. 21:22–23). "Fear of God" is also to be expected among foreigners, just as soon afterwards, in Genesis 22, Abraham himself has to show it. With all this Genesis 20 also already recalls the "Diaspora novellas" of the Old Testament: the Joseph story, the Daniel legends and the book of Esther.[37]

The Genesis Apocryphon has evidently seen this relationship and takes it up directly. However, it has shifted the emphases here. The friendly features of the foreign ruler, who in Genesis 20 has become a proselyte, are all omitted. Instead of this the violent side of the foreign ruler is emphasized. By contrast, what is taken up from the "Diaspora novellas" and introduced into the narrative are the mantic and magical capacities of the hero and with them the moral and intellectual superiority of the Judaism which maintains itself in the Diaspora, both of which have a moral basis. Therefore in the Apocryphon it is not the king but Abraham who has a dream that foretells the course of things. It is not the king's innocence and fear of God but Abraham's innocence and Sarah's purity which count. It is not the king, but Abraham, who speaks with his God in a prayer the beginning of which recalls Daniel 2 and the prayers in Daniel and (Greek) Esther. One could say that in the Apocryphon the foreign ruler and Abraham, who in Genesis 20 (and in 21:22–34) have come to terms with each other, fall apart again. It seems as if the exegesis of the story in the Genesis Apocryphon arose in direct competition with the exegesis put forward in Genesis 20.

This result of the comparison between Genesis 20 and the Genesis Apocryphon is no chance one. Rather, it is already starting to develop in the history of the exegesis of the narrative within the Hebrew Bible itself. Of the three variants in Genesis 12, 20 and 26, in all probability Genesis 20 is the latest. At any rate this is recognized today in the relationship between Genesis 12 and 20. The latter variant presupposes the former version in

---

[35] KÖCKERT 2006, 152–161; see also BLUM 1984, 408–409, 414–416. Both are thinking of the postexilic period. Contrary to this, SCHMITT 2004, 269–270 is suggesting the situation after the destruction of Samaria 722 BCE.

[36] See LEVIN 1993, 174.

[37] See MEINHOLD 1975. For the place of such narratives in the history of literature and theology see KRATZ 1991b.

literary terms and reinterprets it.[38] One can even infer it from the rewriting in Genesis 20. Not only does its narrative mode, above all at the beginning, presuppose knowledge of Genesis 12, but 20:13 explicitly says that the instruction to Sarah to pretend that Abraham is her brother has been given not just for one occasion in Egypt (in Genesis 12) but once and for all "wherever we go". Thus the repetition is incorporated into the course of the Abraham story.[39]

But Gen. 12:10–20, the literary basis of Genesis 20 itself, is also not part of the bedrock of the Abraham tradition. The episode interrupts the context of the narrative in Genesis 12–13 and has been inserted at a secondary stage through the resumption of 12:9 in 13:1 (Abraham in the Negeb) and 12:8 in 13:3–4 (Abraham in Bethel).[40] The insertion is obviously composed in knowledge of the Exodus story and makes a literary reference to it. So this version is already concerned to anchor in the very first representatives of Israel, Abraham and Sarah, experiences of the people of God which are reported only later. And from the beginning it is the experience of the endangering of the people of God that is introduced into the Abraham tradition by the narrative. That puts in question God's promises before they have been fulfilled. Thus as in Genesis 15, 20, and 22, nothing less than the future of Israel is at stake. However, the danger increases more and more both in the course of the history of the tradition and in the course of the narrative, culminating in the temptation of Abraham by God himself.

The relationship of the two variants in Genesis 12 and 20 to the version of the story in Gen. 26:7–14, where it is told of Isaac and Rebecca, is disputed. In contrast to Genesis 12 and 20, the endangering of the patriarch and his wife moves only in the realm of the possible. Here Isaac's claim that Rebecca is his sister is a white lie provoked by the interest of the men of the place in her. However, the deceit is uncovered when the king of the place, who here too is Abimelech of Gerar, sees Isaac doing credit to his name and "caressing" Rebecca (יצחק מצחק את רבקה אשתו). Granted, the king accuses him, but contrary to his fears, Isaac is not killed but, along with Rebecca, declared to be untouchable. Like Abraham in Genesis 12

[38] See VAN SETERS 1975, 167–175, 183, and recently KÖCKERT 2006, 144, 152–154 (with further literature).

[39] This redactional technique, in turn, leads to the question where Abraham said that. The answer is given by the Genesis Apocryphon in XIX:19–20. See BERNSTEIN 1996, 51–52 and above n. 32.

[40] See WELLHAUSEN 1899, 23; LEVIN 1993, 141–142; KRATZ 2005b, 271 n. 37 (2000, 276 n. 64); for a different view, see KÖCKERT 1988, 250–255; BLUM 1984, 307–311, 334, both of them suggesting that it was the primary author of Genesis 12 himself (the exilic "Yahwist" or redactor of "Vätergeschichte 2" respectively) who integrated the story in the context of Genesis 12–13.

and 20, Isaac also goes on to gain riches: not, however, through the king's generosity but through the work of his hands and the blessing of the Lord.

There is much to suggest that by comparison to the two variants in the Abraham tradition this brief Isaac episode, one of several in Genesis 26, represents the original version of the story.[41] It was taken up in the course of the literary development of the Abraham tradition and transferred to the first of the three patriarchs, initially in Genesis 12 and then, with borrowings in the two versions, in Genesis 20. In this way the story has been given different interpretations. In Gen. 26:12 it is the blessing of the Lord bestowed in Gen. 12:1–3 which makes the curious episode, depending on the name of Isaac, a model narrative of the divine preservation of Isaac, the son of Abraham and father of Jacob. In the course of its adaptation to the progenitor Abraham in Gen. 12:10–20 the episode is moved to Egypt, and in analogy to the Exodus story is interpreted as a first test case of the promise. Finally, in Genesis 20 it is demonstrated how the bearers of the promise – under Abimelech of Gerar as in Genesis 26 – are not just preserved even in a foreign land by the blessing of the Lord and adjust to it but can keep their integrity and identity.

Thus already in the literary history from Genesis 26 through Genesis 12 to Genesis 20, i.e. in the inner-biblical interpretation, a development is evident in which questions on the existence of Israel under alien rule and in a foreign land increase from one variant to another. Outside the Hebrew Bible, the exegesis of the story in the Genesis Apocryphon, which links up with Genesis 20, fits seamlessly into this development. The Apocryphon, too, comes up with a new variant exegesis which once again heightens the basic problem and solves it in its own way. It is the way of the genre of the *rewritten Bible*. But the direct connection to Genesis 20 seems to me to be evident. Of course the Apocryphon knows nothing of the literary genesis of the three biblical variants but intuitively takes up the latest version, Genesis 20. Here the Apocryphon perhaps provides a further, indirect proof that it is indeed not Genesis 26 but Genesis 20 which is the latest of the three biblical variants. Even if the external conditions may have changed in the Genesis Apocryphon in comparison with Genesis 20, the two versions are not worlds apart; they share the same experiences of alien rule in the Persian and the Hellenistic periods.[42]

---

[41] Thus already WELLHAUSEN 1885, 320 n. 1 (1905, 317–318 n. 1); NOTH 1948, 115–116; see LEVIN 1993, 141; KRATZ 2005b, 260, 267 (2000, 264, 271–272). For a different view, see VAN SETERS 1975, 175–183; BLUM 1984, 310, both of them suggesting that Genesis 12 is the original version. However, contrary to Van Seters BLUM 1984, 304 n. 12 finds no literary dependence of Genesis 26 on Genesis 12, but only in the relationship between Genesis 20 and the variants in Genesis 12 and 26 (ibid., 406–407).

[42] For the dating of Genesis 20 "at the earliest in the late Persian period" see KÖCKERT 2006, 160. He is thus worlds removed from the opinion of JEREMIAS 2006, 73,

3. Abraham, the father of Isaac

After a detail of the Abraham tradition and a single Genesis narrative we now turn to the Abraham tradition as a whole. We approach the exegesis of the Abraham figure again from outside by first considering the extra-biblical exegesis in Qumran and beginning with two witnesses which came into being outside Qumran but have been handed down and read inside the Qumran community. The first testimony is the summary of the biblical Abraham tradition in the so-called Praise of the Fathers in Sir 44:19–21 (which, unfortunately, is not preserved in the Geniza manuscripts):

19 Αβρααμ μέγας πατὴρ πλήθους ἐθνῶν καὶ οὐχ εὑρέθη ὅμοιος ἐν τῇ δόξῃ 20 ὃς συνετήρησεν νόμον ὑψίστου καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν διαθήκῃ μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ ἔστησεν διαθήκην καὶ ἐν πειρασμῷ εὑρέθη πιστός 21 διὰ τοῦτο ἐν ὅρκῳ ἔστησεν αὐτῷ ἐνευλογηθῆναι ἔθνη ἐν σπέρματι αὐτοῦ πληθῦναι αὐτὸν ὡς χοῦν τῆς γῆς καὶ ὡς ἄστρα ἀνυψῶσαι τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ καὶ κατακληρονομῆσαι αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ θαλάσσης ἕως θαλάσσης καὶ ἀπὸ ποταμοῦ ἕως ἄκρου τῆς γῆς.

19 Abraham was the great father of a multitude of nations, and no one has been found like him in glory; 20 he kept the law of the Most High, and was taken into covenant with him; he established the covenant in his flesh, and when he was tested he was found faithful. 21 Therefore the Lord assured him with an oath that the nations would be blessed through his offspring; that he would make him as numerous as the dust of the earth, and exalt his offspring like the stars, and give them an inheritance from sea to sea and from the River (Euphrates) to the ends of the earth.

The summary is deliberately focussed on the great promises to Abraham (Genesis 12, 15, 17 and 22). It combines the promise of descendants and possession of the land with obedience to the law and covenant (Genesis 17) and with the testings of Abraham in which he has proved his faith (Genesis 15, 22). In Sirach the emphasis is quite clearly on Abraham himself, whereas his sons Isaac and Israel (Jacob) are treated more briefly and in his shadow (Sir 44:22–23) before the Praise of the Fathers comes to speak of Moses and again becomes much broader there. The focussing both on Abraham himself and on the features of the divine promise (including obedience to the law, covenant, and the testing of faith) is significant both in respect of the extra-biblical reception and the exegesis in Qumran as well as of the process of exegesis within the Hebrew Bible in the genesis of the Abraham tradition.

The same applies in its own way to the book of Jubilees. In it we can see how the present text of Genesis is regarded in a *lectio continua*. Here special attention is paid to the promises to Abraham. The abrupt beginning

---

who (by means of Genesis 22) finds the dating of Claus Westermann "in the later period of the monarchy" confirmed for all the "Elohistic" passages in Genesis 20–22 (und thus also for the narrative of Genesis 20).

of the Abraham story in Gen. 12:1 raises many questions and evidently was unsatisfactory. In the book of Jubilees it was given a prehistory which relates at length how Abraham turns to the true God and changes from a pagan into the progenitor of Israel (Jubilees 12). A long admonition to observe the commandment of circumcision (Jub. 15:25–34) is attached to the two covenant texts in Genesis 15 and 17 (Jubilees 14–15).[43] Finally, the rendering of Genesis 22 in Jubilees 17–18 is also along the same line. A theological explanation of this monstrous event is prefaced to it with the appearance of the tempter Mastema, the *Doppelgänger* of the Satan from Job 1–2.[44] The occasion is counted as one of the ten temptations of Abraham and the fear of God in Gen. 22:12 is connected with the faith of Gen. 15:6 (Jub. 17:17–18). Faith, fear of God and obedience to the law are all one for the book of Jubilees. The "love" and his children and children's children (Jub. 17:18; 19:8–9; 30:20–21) belong in this connection.

Let us now go a step further and consider the examples which occur in the Dead Sea Scrolls alongside Sirach and Jubilees and which in part come from the Qumran community itself. It is no surprise that the promise of the "covenant" (Genesis 15 and 17) plays an important role in a religious community which calls itself the "(new) covenant" (1QS II:10; CD VI:19). Often the way of speaking is so polished that it is hardly possible to say with certainty what biblical text is being thought of.[45] In some passages, however, the reference is clear and deliberate. Thus in CD XII:11 and XVI:6 there is a clear reference to the circumcision in Genesis 17. In 4Q158 4:6–8 (Reworked Pentateuch) Gen. 12:1 (ראה hiph'il) and 17:7 (להיות לאלוהים) must be combined; here the promise of the land and covenant is brilliantly connected with the worship and the concluding of the covenant on the mountain of God (Exod. 3:12; 24:4–6). In 4Q464 3 ii:3–4 Gen. 15:13 is

---

[43] Similarly, the brief death scene in Genesis 25 is extended broadly by three long farewell speeches to Ishmael, Isaac und Jacob (Jubilees 20–22). They too focus on obedience to the law. In Jubilees 21 Abraham gives further instructions to Isaac about to how to offer a true sacrifice. This corresponds to his own behaviour on his way through the land, when – in contrast to the biblical tradition – he not only builds altars and calls on the name of Yhwh but also sacrifices in accordance with the precepts of the Torah of Moses. On this see 1QapGen and the handing down of precepts about sacrifice to Levi in 4Q214b 1. Thus the book of Jubilees has Abraham observing the law of Moses and making his sons take it to heart, while according to the biblical narrative he does not really know it at all.

[44] KISTER 1994, 7–15, 20 has shown that the connection is based on a literal understanding of the beginning of Genesis 22 (וַיְהִי אַחַר הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה). For a fuller treatment of the relationship between Genesis 22, Job and Jubilees see VANDERKAM 1997; for a different view, see VAN RUITEN 2002.

[45] See 4Q378 22 i:4 (אשר כרתה עם אברהם); 4Q388a 1 ii:2// 4Q389 1 ii:8 (הברית אשר כרתי עם אברהם); CD III:4 (בעלי ברית לעולם). The phrase כרת ברית is taken from Genesis 15, the addition לעולם from Genesis 17.

again cited and in 4QMMT C 31–32 the famous passage Gen. 15:6 (or the quotation of it in Ps. 106:31) is combined with Deut. 6:18 (לעשות הישר והטוב).[46]

However, two texts are the most interesting. These are, first, the text 4Q225, the so-called Pseudo-Jubilees, and secondly 4Q252, the Commentary on Genesis A already cited on the "friend of God". Both texts, of which the first may have come into being outside the Qumran community and the second within it, are very different, but not dissimilar. In their selective rendering of the Genesis text both compositions pass over directly from the departure of Abraham from Ur Chasdim and Haran to Genesis 15 and from here very soon to Genesis 22.

As it were a short version of the book of Jubilees occurs in 4Q225.[47] The text immediately leaps from the itinerary notes in Gen. 11:31 and 12:4 to Genesis 15 and from here (in connection with Gen. 15:6) to the birth of Isaac in Genesis 21 and the Aqedah in Genesis 22. As in the book of Jubilees, here too Mastema appears as the one who causes the temptation of Abraham; otherwise the rendering passes over both the biblical text and the version in the book of Jubilees. Abraham is attacked by Mastema "because of Isaac" (4Q225 2 I:10 וישטים את אברהם בישחק). Isaac seems to know about the sacrifice and, if the proposed conjectur is correct, to ask his father to bind him duly (4Q225 2 ii:4 [כ]פות אותי יפה);[48] maybe he himself is even exposed to the test (4Q225 2 ii:7–8).[49] Around the altar the angels of the Lord and the angels of Mastema stand opposite each other, the ones weeping, the others triumphing over the end of Isaac (4Q225 2 ii:5–7). The genealogical line of Isaac is extended as far as Levi (4Q225 2 ii:10–12).[50]

---

[46] This expression is also found within the Samaritan Pentateuch in Deut. 12:28, the reverse order in MT. Within 4QMMT the combination of quotations possibly first came about by an addition, a secondary assimilation to Deut. 6:18, as is evident from the variants of the manuscripts: 4Q399 ii:4 הישר, 4Q398 14–17 ii:7 הישר והטוב.

[47] The text is edited by MILIK and VANDERKAM 1994, with corrections regarding fr. 1 in KUGLER and VANDERKAM 2001. For the content see VANDERKAM 1997; BERNSTEIN 1998, 137–138; IDEM 2000; FITZMYER 2002; GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ 2002; KUGLER 2003; KUGEL 2006; and FABRY 2006, 93–101.

[48] MILIK and VANDERKAM 1994, 151–152.

[49] Thus – for the first אם-clause of l. 8 – VERMES 1996, 142 n. 16, 17; GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ 2002, 55; FABRY 2006, 101. For the formulation, however, see 4Q226 7:1, where at least the second אם-clause is clearly related to Abraham; thus MILIK and VANDERKAM 1994, 149–150, 153 find small traces of an א at the end of l. 8 and read: ואם לא ימצא נאמן א[ברהם.

[50] One wonders who is the speaker and who the subject of the phrase לא יהיה אהב in l. 10. The editors in DJD XIII, 153 obviously think of Abraham as the one "who is loving" God, but do not explain the negative clause. VERMES 1996, 142 n. 18, 19 is probably

If we compare the text with the biblical original, not only is the role of Isaac emphasized but – as already in the book of Jubilees – a Priestly interest is also visible which takes possession of the material from Genesis 22 and the genealogy. However, at the same time the original interest in the test of faith articulated in Gen. 22:1, 11 is adopted and intensified by the appearance of Mastema and his hosts. Here we have the phrase אם ימצא כחש ואם לא ימצא נאמן instead of נסה and ירא אלהים (4Q225 2 ii:7–8), whomever it may refer to.[51] But the peculiarities also arise from features in the biblical text which already stand out here: the precise description of the scene of the sacrifice, the aetiology of the cult place and the twofold appearance of an angel of the Lord.

Nothing of all this is to be read in the second text, 4Q252.[52] It too is selective in its choice of the biblical texts. It scatters various comments which serve towards the understanding of the text and responds in its own way to questions which the biblical text leaves open or raises.[53] In genre it seems to be a kind of commentary, as emerges from the citation formula in 4Q252 1 iii:1 and the pesher-formula in 4Q252 1 i:5–6, although the typical scheme of quotation and interpretation is not preserved. However, the mention of the "men of the community" (אנשי היחד) in 4Q252 1 v:5 suggests that the text belongs in one way or the other to the Qumran community.

It is above all the combination of Genesis 15 and 22 that is important for us. Like the allusions to Genesis 18 it could refer to the theme of the possession of the land and its justification over against other claims expounded in the incidental remark of 4Q252 II:8. The other passages which extend the question to the present and the eschatological future by means of Gen. 49:10 would also fit here. From this perspective it would be understandable why, following the allusion to Genesis 18, it is not the Aqedah itself but only the outcome of the story in Gen. 22:10–12 that is quoted.

---

correct that it is not Mastema (or his angels) but God who is speaking in l. 9–10. Thus God is denying that Abraham "will not be loving" God and for that is blessing Isaac.

[51] However, MILIK and VANDERKAM 1994, 149, 151, 153 suggest the reading: "And [in all this the Prince of the Mastemah was testing (ינסה) whether] he would be found weak, and whether A[braham] should not be found faithful [to God".

[52] The text is edited by BROOKE 1996. For the content see IDEM 1994; BERNSTEIN 1994; the dispute between the two in JQR 85 (1994–95): BROOKE 1994–95, and BERNSTEIN 1994–95. For the textcritical aspects see BROOKE 1998.

[53] Because of the bad state of preservation it is difficult to grasp the overall arrangement of the work. In the sphere of the flood story problems of chronology seem to be in the foreground. In the story of Noah's vineyard there is an answer to the question why God did not curse the evildoer Ham, but his son Canaan. Of Abraham, verses and motifs from Genesis 11, 15, 18, and 22 are quoted, then follows something from Genesis 28, 36, and 49. For the overall structure or theme see the debate between BROOKE and BERNSTEIN above n. 52.

But here too as in Sirach, the book of Jubilees and Pseudo-Jubilees, the promise texts of Genesis are in view. Here they are expounded more in connection with the question of the possession of the land, but in other places more in connection with Abraham's faith and faithfulness to the law.

It will not have escaped those who know even a little about the discussion on the Pentateuch that the examples of extra-biblical exegesis given above time and again refer to texts which also have a fundamental significance in the composition of Genesis. This is not the place to analyze in detail the composition and the history of the Abraham tradition.[54] But here are just a few indications to make it clear that the basic pillars of the composition to which the extra-biblical exegesis instinctively refers also played a decisive role in the growth of the tradition and the process of exegesis within the Hebrew Bible itself.

Taking the patriarchal narratives as a whole, there is a general consensus that among the three patriarchs Abraham is "perhaps the youngest figure in the company, and it was probably at a comparatively late period that he was put before his son Isaac".[55] The nucleus of the patriarchal tradition is the Jacob narratives. First the formerly independent Isaac tradition in Genesis 26(–27) was incorporated as a "preface" to Jacob and finally the Abraham tradition was inserted in Genesis 12–25. The development of the exegesis within the Hebrew Bible can already be seen here: it runs more and more to Abraham as the leader of the patriarchs and the one with whom Israel begins, and this continues in the reception both within and outside the Hebrew Bible.

Within the Abraham tradition in turn the Abraham-Lot cycle in Genesis 12–13; 18–19 and 21, which makes Abraham the father of Isaac, and within that the narrative about Lot in Sodom in Genesis 19, can be isolated as the earliest traditions. Everything else has gradually accrued to Abraham and has made him the dominant patriarchal figure. Here the three great promise texts, Genesis 12, 15 and 17, have played a decisive role, which is also significant for their literary history.[56] The texts make it possible to distinguish a Priestly and a non-Priestly layer. The Priestly tradition of Abraham is easiest to identify. It is dominated by the speech of

[54] The most important contributions in recent years are those by VAN SETERS 1975; BLUM 1984; KÖCKERT 1988; LEVIN 1993. My view of things can be read in KRATZ 2005b, 260–274 (2000, 263–280), especially on Abraham 270–272 (275–278).

[55] WELLHAUSEN 1885, 320 (1905, 317); see NOTH 1948, 113–114.

[56] In this respect HOFTIJZER 1956 was "a bird who sang before the morning". See also RENDTORFF 1976.

promise in Genesis 17 and presupposes a pre-Priestly tradition.[57] This earlier version, which is presupposed and reinterpreted by the Priestly Writing, is to be found in the non-Priestly material in Genesis 12–25, but the latter contains texts which both precede and come after the Priestly Writing and not least for that reason is extraordinarily disputed.[58]

At all events we can trace back the (Yahwistic) promise in Genesis 12 (vv. 1–3) and Genesis 28 (vv. 13–15) to the basic pre-Priestly composition or redaction respectively. This pre-Priestly composition or redaction makes a connection between the creation stories and the patriarchal history, is responsible for the genealogical and geographical connection of the three patriarchs, and puts the whole patriarchal history under the theme of "blessing".[59] The development from the (Yahwistic) stratum represented by Genesis 12 and 28 to the Priestly Writing represented by Genesis 17 already indicates a clear step on the way to the later extra-biblical tradition of exegesis. In Gen. 17:20 the "blessing" of Gen. 12:1–3 passes over to the collateral branch of Ishmael ("great people"). For the main branch of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (Israel) the "covenant" and the "sign of the covenant", circumcision, are added in Genesis 17 as new theological categories in the Abraham tradition (see Sir 44:19–20). The combination of patriarchs and law and the notion that Abraham already observed the law of Moses, which he did not even yet know, are introduced by the Priestly Writing into Genesis. Above all the exegesis of the book of Jubilees follows this path, though it also takes in the other line of exegesis represented by Genesis 15 and 22 and combines it with its Priestly interests.

Alongside the (Yahwistic) promise of the blessing (Genesis 12) and the later Priestly promise of the covenant (Genesis 17), Genesis 15 represents a third type of exegesis which has been introduced into Genesis and persistently shapes the tradition. Here, too, as in Genesis 17, the "covenant" oc-

---

[57] Gen. 11:27–32; 12:4b–5; 13:6, 11b–12; (19:29?); 16:1a, 3, (15–)16; 17:1–27; 21:1b–5; 23:1–20 and 25:7–11a belong to the Priestly Writing. See KRATZ 2005b, 238–240 (2000, 240–242).

[58] Traditionally this material has been divided between the two sources J (Jahwist) und E (Elohist), along with various additions and the redactor who has brought together the sources J, E or JE, and P. The fundamental works on this were and still are WELLHAUSEN 1899 and NOTH 1948, 17–19, 29–35, 38–39. However, in recent times the voices have multiplied of those who do not discover any sources in it but a basic literary stratum which for the first time brought together earlier traditions about Abraham and the other patriarchs into a narrative thread which in turn was revised and expanded several times both before and after the Priestly Writing: BLUM 1984 and LEVIN 1993 are basic works here. See KRATZ 2005b, 225–229 (2000, 226–230).

[59] On this stratum see KRATZ 2005b, 261–265 (2000, 265–269). In BLUM 1984, this composition is divided into "Vg^1" (Vätergeschichte 1) and "Vg^2" (Vätergeschichte 2); in LEVIN 1993, as usually, it is called "J" (Jahwist) and is described as a Yahwistic redaction which has brought the early fragmentary sources together.

curs in connection with the promise of descendants and possession of the land. However, in Genesis 15 both promise and covenant are assured against the background of a danger to descendants and grounded in the faith of Abraham, which "he (God) reckoned to him (Abraham) as righteousness" (Gen. 15:6). This is the starting point for the promises in Genesis, which are given "for Abraham's sake" and in one passage are explicitly connected with Abraham's obedience to the law.[60]

In the course of the narrative Genesis 15 stands between Genesis 12(–14) and (16–)17. However, there is fierce controversy over where it belongs in terms of content and time. The passages which used to be assigned to the "Elohist", to which alongside Genesis 15 the narratives in Genesis 20–22 (apart from 21:1–7 and 22:20–24) belong, are increasingly suspected of being post-Priestly additions.[61] The passages are not dissimilar to the "midrash" on the Abraham tradition in Genesis 14.[62] Like this, they resort to the wider literary context, in part take up earlier tradition, and extend it further in a narrative and theological way.[63] It is hard to say whether these passages were written for the context or alongside it. All that is clear is that in these "Elohistic" passages a distinct interpretation of the Abraham tradition within the Hebrew Bible is to be grasped.[64] This interpretation is the result of deep theological reflection and has not only shaped the biblical tradition but in the correlation of faith (Gen. 15:6) and fear of God (Gen. 22:12) has also exercised a great influence on the extra-biblical interpretation.

---

[60] See Gen. 18:18–19; 22:15–18; 26:3–5, 24.

[61] See LEVIN 1993, 151, 172–173; IDEM 2004; SCHMID 1999, 172–186; IDEM 2004; for Genesis 22 already VEIJOLA 1988, esp. 155; and also BLUM 2002, esp. 142–145, who now dates his formely pre-Priestly "KD" (D-Composition) – to which Genesis 15 and the similar promises as well as most of the "E"-texts belong – in part after the Priestly Writing. A totally different view is taken by GRAUPNER 2002, 182–218; SCHMITT 2004; JEREMIAS 2006. They (still or again) propose a pre-Priestly and pre-exilic dating of the "E"-texts in Genesis 20–22. For a pre-Priestly dating of Genesis 15 (with the exception of a few secondary additions) see ZIEMER 2005, 166–184, whereas GERTZ 2002, proposes again a division between pre- and post-Priestly layers in Genesis 15.

[62] See WELLHAUSEN 1899, 24–25, and most recently ZIEMER 2005, 11–162; GRANERØD 2008.

[63] Genesis chap. 12 (and 17?) in chap. 15; 12:10–20 and 26:1–14 in 20:1–18; chap. 16(–17?) in 21:(8,) 9–21; 26:15–33 in 21:2–34; chap. 12 and 15 in chap. 22.

[64] For the narrative and theological profile of Genesis 20–22 see most recently JEREMIAS 2006. He works out very well the common features and the differences between Ishmael and Abraham in Genesis 21 and 22, though these recall less the conditions of "the later monarchy" than the treatment of both in Genesis 17. But the question remains: does Genesis 17 express the theology of Genesis 15 and 20–22 in Priestly terms or do the E-passages in Genesis 15 und 20–22 give a narrative exegesis not only of J, but already also of P?

As we have seen, Sirach 44, the rendering of Genesis 22 in Jubilees 17 and the selection of texts in 4Q225 and 4Q252 bear eloquent witness to this influence. One might say that 4Q225 is an excerpt from the "Elohist", in other words those non-Priestly passages which also have an exceptional position in Genesis itself and which rewrite the Abraham tradition in a midrash-like way along the lines of Genesis 15.[65] Perhaps we may take this particular evidence and the linking of the Genesis Apocryphon to other "Elohistic" variants of the story of the ancestress in Genesis 20 as an indication that these texts are to be classified as post- rather than pre-Priestly. To the Priestly covenant and the law they add faith and the fear of God, which make it possible also to master the crises of the promise and obedience to the law. As Sirach, the book of Jubilees and all the other exegesis show, soon no distinction was drawn between the different features of the promise texts. What had already been made clear in the text of Genesis by many textual references was here spelt out. Thus faith, fear of God and law became one. Despite all the differences and discontinuities of inner- and extra-biblical interpretation one has to say that there seems to be also a certain continuity in the understanding and rewriting of the biblical tradition within and outside the Hebrew Bible.

Bibliography

ALLEGRO 1968: ALLEGRO, J., Qumrân Cave 4 I (4Q158–4Q186) (DJD V), Oxford 1968, 60–67, Pl. XXII–XXIII.

ALLISON 2003: ALLISON JR., D. C., Testament of Abraham (Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature), Berlin 2003.

AURELIUS 2003: AURELIUS, E., Der Ursprung des Ersten Gebots, ZThK 100 (2003) 1–21.

BERNSTEIN 1994: BERNSTEIN, M. J., 4Q252: From Re-Written Bible to Biblical Commentary, JJS 45 (1994) 1–27.

– 1994–95: 4Q252: Method and Context, Genre and Sources, JQR 85 (1994–95) 61–79.

– 1996: Re-Arrangement, Anticipation and Harmonization as Exegetical Features in the Genesis Apocryphon, DSD 3 (1996) 37–57.

– 1998: Pentateuchal Interpretation at Qumran, in: The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years. A Comprehensive Assessment 1, ed. P. W. FLINT and J. C. VANDERKAM, Leiden 1998, 128–159.

– 2000: Angels at the Aqedah: A Study in the Development of a Midrashic Motif, DSD 7 (2000) 263–291.

BLUM 1984: BLUM, E. Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte (WMANT 57), Neukirchen-Vluyn 1984.

[65] However, that does not mean that the authors of 4Q252 had before them the source "E" or the special passages in Genesis 15 and 20–22. Rather, the example teaches us that no far-reaching conclusions for redaction history can be drawn from late redactions, copies and excerpts.

– 2002: Die literarische Verbindung von Erzvätern und Exodus: Ein Gespräch mit neueren Endredaktionshypothesen, in: Abschied vom Jahwisten: Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion (BZAW 315), ed. J. C. GERTZ et al., Berlin 2002, 119–156.

BROOKE 1994: BROOKE, G. J., The Genre of 4Q252: From Poetry to Pesher, DSD 1 (1994) 160–179.

– 1994–95: The Thematic Content of 4Q252, JQR 85 (1994–95) 33–59.

– 1996: BROOKE, G. J. et al., Qumran Cave 4 XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3 (DJD XXII), Oxford 1996, 185–207, Pl. XII–XIII.

– 1998: Some Remarks on 4Q252 and the Text of Genesis, Textus 19 (1998) 1–25.

DILLMANN 1882: DILLMANN, A., Die Genesis (Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament 1), Leipzig ^{4}1882.

EGO 1996: EGO, B., Abraham als Urbild der Toratreue Israels: Traditionsgeschichtliche Überlegungen zu einem Aspekt des biblischen Abrahambildes, in: Bund und Tora: Zur theologischen Begriffsgeschichte in alttestamentlicher, frühjüdischer und urchristlicher Tradition (WUNT 92), ed. F. AVEMARIE and H. LICHTENBERGER, Tübingen 1996, 25–40.

EVANS 2000: EVANS, C. A., Art. Abraham, in: Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls 1, Oxford 2000, 2–4.

FABRY 2006: FABRY, H.-J., Isaak in den Handschriften von Qumran, in: From 4QMMT to Resurrection. Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech (STDJ 61), ed. F. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ et al., Leiden 2006, 87–103.

FITZMYER 2002: FITZMYER, J. A., The Sacrifice of Isaac in Qumran Literature, Bib. 83 (2002) 210–229.

– 2004: The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I (1Q20): A Commentary, Third Edition, Rom 2004.

GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ 2002: GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, F., The Sacrifice of Isaac in 4Q225, in: The Sacrifice of Isaac: The Aqedah (Genesis 22) and Its Interpretations (Themes in Biblical Interpretation 4), ed. E. NOORT and E. TIGCHELAAR, Leiden 2002, 44–57.

GERTZ 2002: GERTZ, J. C., Abraham, Mose und der Exodus: Beobachtungen zur Redaktionsgeschichte von Gen 15, in: Abschied vom Jahwisten: Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion (BZAW 315), ed. J. C. GERTZ et al., Berlin 2002, 63–81.

GRANERØD 2008: GRANERØD, G., Abraham, Melchizedek ans Chedolaomer: An Attempt to Read Genesis14 as the Work of Scribal Activity in the Second Temple Times, PhD Dissertation, Oslo 2008 (to be publishes in BZAW).

GRAUPNER 2002: GRAUPNER, A., Der Elohist: Gegenwart und Wirksamkeit des transzendenten Gottes in der Geschichte (WMANT 97), Neukirchen-Vluyn 2002.

HALPERN-AMARU 2006: HALPERN-AMARU, B., A Note on Isaac as First-Born in *Jubilees* and Only Son in 4Q225, DSD 13 (2006) 127–133.

HØGENHAVEN 2007: HØGENHAVEN, J., The Literary Character of 4QTanhumim, DSD 14 (2007) 99–123.

HOFTIJZER 1956: HOFTIJZER, J., Die Verheissungen an die drei Erzväter, Leiden 1956.

JACOBSON 1993a: JACOBSON, H., 4Q252: Addenda, JJS 44 (1993) 118–120.

– 1993b: 4Q252 fr. 1: Further Comments, JJS 44 (1993) 291–293.

JENNI 1971: JENNI, E., Art. אהב *'hb* lieben, in: THAT III (1971) 60–73.

JEREMIAS 2006: JEREMIAS, J., Gen 20–22 als theologisches Programm, in: Auf dem Weg zur Endgestalt von Genesis bis II Regnum. Festschrift für Hans-Christoph Schmitt (BZAW 370), ed. M. BECK and U. SCHORN, Berlin/New York 2006, 59–73.

KISTER 1994: KISTER, M., Observations on Aspects of Exegesis, Tradition, and Theology in Midrash, Pseudepigrapha, and Other Jewish Writings, in: Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha (SBLEJL 6), ed. J. REEVES, Atlanta 1994, 1–34.

KOCH 2006: KOCH, C., Zwischen Hatti und Assur: Traditionsgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zu den aramäischen Inschriften von Sfire, in: Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke: Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur „Deuteronomismus"-Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten (BZAW 365), ed. M. WITTE et al., Berlin/New York 2006, 379–406.

KÖCKERT 1988: KÖCKERT, M., Vätergott und Väterverheißungen: Eine Auseinandersetzung mit Albrecht Alt und seinen Erben (FRLANT 142), Göttingen 1988.

– 2006: Ahnvater, Fremdling, Weiser: Lesarten der Bibel in Gen 12, Gen 20 und Qumran, in: Das Buch der Bücher – gelesen: Lesarten der Bibel in den Wissenschaften und Künsten (Publikationen zur Zeitschrift für Germanistik NF 13), ed. S. MARTUS und A. POLASCHEGG, Bern 2006, 139–169.

KRATZ 1991a: KRATZ, R. G., Kyros im Deuterojesajabuch: Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Entstehung und Theologie von Jes 40–55 (FAT 1), Tübingen 1991.

– 1991b: Translatio imperii: Untersuchungen zu den aramäischen Danielerzählungen und ihrem theologiegeschichtlichen Umfeld (WMANT 63), Neukirchen-Vluyn 1991.

– 2005a: „Höre Israel" und Dekalog, in: Die Zehn Worte: Der Dekalog als Testfall der Pentateuchkritik (QD 212), ed. C. FREVEL et al., Freiburg 2005, 77–86.

– 2005b: The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament (transl. by John Bowden), London/New York 2005 (German original version: Die Komposition der erzählenden Bücher des Alten Testaments, Göttingen 2000).

– 2006: Das Judentum im Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels (FAT 42), Tübingen ^{2}2006.

– 2007: Geschichten und Geschichte in den nordwestsemitischen Inschriften des 1. Jahrtausends v. Chr., in: Was ist ein Text? Alttestamentliche, ägyptologische und altorientalische Perspektiven (BZAW 363), ed. L. MORENZ and S. SCHORCH, Berlin/New York 2007, 284–309.

KUGEL 2006: KUGEL, J. L., Exegetical Notes on 4Q225 'Pseudo-Jubilees', DSD 13 (2006) 73–98.

KUGLER 2003: KUGLER, R. A., Hearing 4Q225: A Case Study in Reconstructing the Religious Imagination of the Qumran Community, DSD 10 (2003) 81–103.

KUGLER and VANDERKAM 2001: KUGLER, R. A. and VANDERKAM, J. C., A Note on 4Q225 (Pseudo-Jubilees), RdQ 20/77 (2001) 109–116.

LEVIN 1993: LEVIN, C., Der Jahwist (FRLANT 157), Göttingen 1993.

– 2004: Jahwe und Abraham im Dialog: Genesis 15, in: Gott und Mensch im Dialog. Festschrift für Otto Kaiser (BZAW 345/I), Berlin/New York 2004, 236–257.

LIM 1992: LIM, T., The Chronology of the Flood Story in a Qumran Text (4Q252), JJS 43 (1992) 288–298.

– 1993: Notes on 4Q252 fr. 1, cols. i–ii, JJS 44 (1993) 121–126.

MARTIN-ACHARD 1977: MARTIN-ACHARD, R. et al., Art. Abraham, in: Theologische Realenzyklopädie 1, Berlin/New York 1977, 364–392.

MEINHOLD 1975: MEINHOLD, A., Die Gattung der Josephsgeschichte und des Estherbuches: Diasporanovelle I, ZAW 87 (1975) 306–324.

MILIK and VANDERKAM 1994: MILIK, J. T. and VANDERKAM, J. C., 225. 4QPseudo-Jubilees, Qumran Cave 4 VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1 (DJD XIII), Oxford 1994, 141–155, Pl. X.

MILLARD 1992: MILLARD, A. R. et al., Art. Abraham, in: The Anchor Bible Dictionary 1, New York et al. 1992, 35–44.

MORAN 1963: MORAN, W. L., The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy, CBQ 25 (1963) 77–87.

NICKELSBURG 1998: NICKELSBURG, G. W. E., Patriarchs Who Worry About Their Wives: A Haggadic Tendency in the Genesis Apocryphon, in: Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls (STDJ 28), Leiden 1998, 137–158.

NOTH 1948: NOTH, M., Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch, Stuttgart 1948.

OEGEMA 1999: OEGEMA, G. S., Für Israel und die Völker: Studien zum alttestamentlich-jüdischen Hintergrund der paulinischen Theologie (NT.S 95), Leiden 1999.

OSSWALD 1960: OSSWALD, E., Beobachtungen zur Erzählung von Abrahams Aufenthalt in Ägypten im »Genesis-Apokryphon«, ZAW 72 (1960) 7–25.

QIMRON 1992: QIMRON, E., Towards a New Edition of the Genesis Apocryphon, JSP 10 (1992) 11–18.

RENDTORFF 1976: RENDTORFF, R., Das überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuch (BZAW 147), Berlin/New York 1976.

RÜTERSWÖRDEN 2006: RÜTERSWÖRDEN, U., Die Liebe zu Gott im Deuteronomium, in: Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke: Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur „Deuteronomismus"-Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten (BZAW 365), ed. M. WITTE et al., Berlin/New York 2006, 229–238.

SARNA 1971: SARNA, N. M. et al., Art. Arbraham, in: Encyklopaedia Judaica 2, Jerusalem/New York 1971, 111–125.

SCHMID 1999: SCHMID, K., Erzväter und Exodus: Untersuchungen zur doppelten Begründung der Ursprünge Israels innerhalb der Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments (WMANT 81), Neukirchen-Vluyn 1999.

– 2004: Die Rückgabe der Verheißungsgabe: Der „heilsgeschichtliche" Sinn von Gen 22 im Horizont innerbiblischer Exegese, in: Gott und Mensch im Dialog. Festschrift für Otto Kaiser (BZAW 345/I), Berlin/New York 2004, 271–300.

SCHMITT 2004: SCHMITT, H.-C., Menschliche Schuld, göttliche Führung und ethische Wandlung: Zur Theologie von Gen 20,1–21,21* und zum Problem des Beginns des „Elohisitischen Geschichtswerks", in: Gott und Mensch im Dialog. Festschrift für Otto Kaiser (BZAW 345/I), Berlin/New York 2004, 259–270.

SPIECKERMANN 2000: SPIECKERMANN, H., Mit der Liebe im Wort: Ein Beitrag zur Theologie des Deuteronomiums, in: Liebe und Gebot: Studien zum Deuteronomium. Festschrift für Lothar Perlitt (FRLANT 190), ed. R. G. KRATZ and H. SPIECKERMANN, Göttingen 2000, 190–205.

STANLEY 1992: STANLEY, C. D., The Importance of *4QTanhumim* (4Q176), RdQ 15/60 (1992) 569–582.

STRÜBIND 1991: STRÜBIND, K., Tradition als Interpretation in der Chronik: König Josaphat als Paradigma chronistischer Hermeneutik und Theologie (BZAW 201), Berlin/New York 1991.

TOV 2002: TOV, E., The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* Series (DJD XXXIX), Oxford 2002, 238–239.

VANDERKAM 1997: VANDERKAM, J. C., The *Aqedah*, Jubilees and Pseudo-Jubilees, in: The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders (Biblical Interpretation Series 28), ed. C. A. EVANS and S. TALMON, Leiden 1997, 241–261.

VAN RUITEN 2002: VAN RUITEN, J. T. A. G. M., Abraham, Job and the Book of *Jubilees*: The Intertextual Relationship of Genesis 22:1–19, Job 1–2:13 and *Jubilees* 17:15–18:19, in: The Sacrifice of Isaac: The Aqedah (Genesis 22) and Its Interpretations

(Themes in Biblical Interpretation 4), ed. E. NOORT, and E. TIGCHELAAR, Leiden 2002, 58–85.

VAN SETERS 1975: VAN SETERS, J., Abraham in History and Tradition, New Haven 1975.

VEIJOLA 1988: VEIJOLA, T., Das Opfer des Abraham – Paradigma des Glaubens aus dem nachexilischen Zeitalter, ZThK 85 (1988) 129–164.

VERMES 1983: VERMES, G., Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies (Studia Post-Biblica 4), Leiden ^{3}1983.

– 1996: New Light on the Sacrifice of Isaac from 4Q225, JJS 47 (1996) 140–146.

WELLHAUSEN 1885: WELLHAUSEN, J., Prolegomena to the History of Israel (trans. by J. Sutherland Black and Allan Menzies), Edinburgh 1885 (reprint Atlanta, Georgia 1994); German original version: Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels, Berlin ^{6}1905.

– 1899: Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments, Berlin ^{3}1899 (reprint 1963).

ZIEMER 2005: ZIEMER, B., Abram – Abraham: Kompositionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Genesis 14, 15 und 17 (BZAW 350), Berlin/New York 2005.