

Contents



<i>Introduction</i>	<i>ix</i>
<i>John Barton</i>	

<i>List of Contributors</i>	<i>xi</i>
-----------------------------	-----------

Part I.

The Hebrew Bible in Its Historical and Social Context	1
1. The Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament	3
<i>John Barton</i>	
2. The Historical Framework	24
Biblical and Scholarly Portrayals of the Past	
<i>Francesca Stavrakopoulou</i>	
3. The Social and Cultural History of Ancient Israel	54
<i>Katherine Southwood</i>	
4. Israel in the Context of the Ancient Near East	86
<i>Anthony J. Frendo</i>	

Part II.

Major Genres of Biblical Literature	107
5. The Narrative Books of the Hebrew Bible	109
<i>Thomas Römer</i>	
6. The Prophetic Literature	133
<i>R. G. Kratz</i>	
7. Legal Texts	160
<i>Assnat Bartor</i>	
8. The Wisdom Literature	183
<i>Jennie Grillo</i>	
9. The Psalms and Poems of the Hebrew Bible	206
<i>Susan Gillingham</i>	

Part III.	
Major Religious Themes	237
10. Monotheism	239
<i>Benjamin D. Sommer</i>	
11. Creation	271
God and World	
<i>Hermann Spieckermann</i>	
12. The Human Condition	293
<i>Hilary Marlow</i>	
13. God's Covenants with Humanity and Israel	312
<i>Dominik Markl</i>	
14. Ethics	338
<i>C. L. Crouch</i>	
15. Religious Space and Structures	356
<i>Stephen C. Russell</i>	
16. Ritual	378
Diet, Purity, and Sacrifice	
<i>Seth D. Kunin</i>	
Part IV.	
The Study and Reception of the Hebrew Bible	403
17. Reception of the Old Testament	405
<i>Alison Gray</i>	
18. Historical-Critical Inquiry	431
<i>Christoph Bultmann</i>	
19. Literary Approaches	455
<i>David Jasper</i>	
20. Theological Approaches to the Old Testament	481
<i>R. W. L. Moberly</i>	
21. Political and Advocacy Approaches	507
<i>Eryl W. Davies</i>	
22. Textual Criticism and Biblical Translation	532
<i>Carmel McCarthy</i>	

23. To Map or Not to Map?	556
A Biblical Dilemma	
<i>Adrian Curtis</i>	
<i>Index of Scripture</i>	575
<i>Index of Modern Authors</i>	589
<i>Index of Subjects</i>	596

1



The Hebrew Bible and the Old Testament

John Barton

What is traditionally known as the Old Testament is a collection of the main books that were regarded as sacred Scripture in Judaism by the last few centuries BCE. The majority were written in the kingdom of Judah (which later became the Persian province of Yehud) and indeed in its capital, Jerusalem, between the eighth and the second centuries. But there is material in the books that may be much older: some think that there are texts here that go back into the tenth or eleventh century and thus are older than Homer in Greece.¹ So far as actual manuscripts are concerned, the earliest are those found at Khirbet Qumran by the Dead Sea in the twentieth century, normally known as the Dead Sea Scrolls, which contain at least fragments of almost all the biblical books. These manuscripts are in most cases no older than the first century BCE, and thereafter we have nothing before the great codices of the early Middle Ages, the Aleppo Codex and the Leningrad/St. Petersburg Codex. So whereas for the cultures of Mesopotamia and Egypt we possess actual manuscripts from as far back as the third millennium BCE, in the case of the literature of ancient Israel we are dependent on much later texts. It is clear, however, that the contents of the books do in many cases go back into a much earlier period than the extant manuscripts.

The Old Testament is often rightly referred to as a library of books rather than a single book, since it consists of a large variety of texts of different kinds, reflecting different periods in the history of ancient Israel. Though there are stories in the early books that tell of leaders and heroes such as Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, and Joshua, it is not until the eleventh century at the earliest that we can really speak of Israel as a nation, under the reigns of David and Solomon: many biblical scholars think that even these figures are mostly legendary. After the

death of Solomon, in the mid-tenth century, “Israel” divided into two, the larger northern kingdom (known variously as Ephraim and, confusingly, Israel) and the smaller southern kingdom of Judah; these kingdoms continued to exist until the 720s, when the northern state was conquered by the Assyrians and became an Assyrian province, and the early sixth century, when Jerusalem fell to the Babylonians under Nebuchadnezzar and many of the population of Judah were deported to Mesopotamia. It is widely believed that many books in the Old Testament came into being during the eighth and seventh centuries: one or two, such as Hosea and Amos, in the north, but far more in the south, where Jerusalem was probably a center of scribal culture. The major ancient traditions about Moses and his predecessors, now in the Pentateuch (“five books of Moses”—Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy), may have begun to take shape during this period, though they were certainly also worked on after the exile.

The Babylonian Exile of the Judaeans never ended, in that there was a sizable Jewish presence in Mesopotamia from the sixth century onward; but nevertheless a substantial number of the exiles (or their descendants) succeeded in returning to the land once the Babylonians were conquered by the Persian king Cyrus, and Judah was reconstituted as a small Persian province under a native governor, so that Jewish life continued in the homeland. The sixth century, which was so disastrous politically for the Jews, was also an era in which writing seems to have flourished, with significant collections of prophetic texts such as parts of the books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel taking shape, alongside a major edition of the history of Israel from the settlement under Joshua down to the exile itself, in what are usually called the “historical” books (Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings). The postexilic age also saw many important writings, with the collections Psalms and Proverbs (though parts of those books may be older), the book of Job, and large sections of the Pentateuch being written at this time.

In the fourth century Alexander the Great conquered the Persian Empire. Under him and his successors Jewish life continued quietly until the political upheavals of the second century, when Judaism began for the first time to be persecuted by the Syrian king Antiochus IV, provoking revolt by the freedom fighters known as the Maccabees. It is from this “Hellenistic” period, when Greek customs and thought began to make

inroads into Jewish life, that we have the book of Ecclesiastes (Qoheleth in Hebrew) and the book of Daniel, as well as a number of what are nowadays often referred to as “Jewish novels,” such as Ruth and Esther. Even more important, the Hellenistic age saw the codification of Jewish scripture into a coherent collection, so that something recognizable as the collection we now possess had come into being.

OLD TESTAMENT OR HEBREW BIBLE?

This book is called *The Hebrew Bible*, but so far I have freely used the term *Old Testament*, which is the name by which the collection of books just described is usually known in Western literary culture. It is obvious, however, that it is in origin a Christian term, since it contrasts with the “New Testament,” which tells of the acts and words of Jesus in the Gospels and contains an account of the early church in the Acts of the Apostles, as well as early Christian letters and the book of Revelation. We first hear the Jewish scriptures described as books “of the old covenant” in the work of Bishop Melito of Sardis, who died about 190 CE. By this it is meant that God has entered into a new kind of relationship with the human race through Jesus Christ—the “new” covenant, as described in Hebrews 10; and the books of Jewish scripture are witnesses to his previous, or “old,” covenant with his people in pre-Christian times. (*Testamentum* is simply the Latin translation of *covenant*.)

From a Christian perspective this would have seemed a merely factual point, but it is easy to see that from a Jewish point of view it might not sound so innocent. The Letter to the Hebrews describes the new covenant in Christ as superseding the old one, so that *old* is not just a temporal but in a sense an evaluative term: “He abolishes the first in order to establish the second” (Heb. 10:9); “In speaking of a ‘new covenant,’ he has made the old one obsolete. And what is obsolete and growing old will soon disappear” (Heb. 8:13). So in Christian usage, as heard, at least sometimes correctly, by Jews, *old* can have the sense of “superannuated,” surpassed, superseded. Hence in modern times many Jews, and Christians sensitive to such matters, have come to think that the term *Old Testament* is somewhat anti-Jewish in tone. It is of course not common on Jewish lips anyway: Jews tend to refer to the collection simply as

“the Bible,” since for them the “New Testament” is not part of their Bible anyway. (In Israeli universities people who teach the “Old Testament” are called professors of Bible, and the departments in which they work are called departments of Bible, entirely logically.)

In academic circles a popular response to this problem has been to call these books “the Hebrew Bible” (sometimes “the Hebrew Scriptures”). This avoids the problem of the “supersessionism” felt to be implicit in the term *Old Testament*. There are, however, at least three problems about it—not necessarily reasons not to adopt it but revealing, once probed, some important aspects of the books in question. First, “Hebrew Bible” is not strictly accurate, since parts of the collection are in fact in Aramaic rather than Hebrew. Second, “Old Testament” scholars have traditionally been very interested in the Greek and Latin translations of these books, which produces the odd result that there are “Hebrew Bible” scholars who in fact work mainly on Greek or Latin texts. And third, not all of what at least some Christians have included in their Old Testament is part of the scriptures of Judaism, and that includes some texts that never existed in Hebrew or even Aramaic but were in Greek from the beginning. We shall go on next to examine these difficulties.

Meanwhile, however, it is fair to note that the term *Hebrew Bible* does resolve the “supersessionist” difficulty, and in North America it is now the normal term of choice in academic discussion of the Bible. In Britain the usage is more patchy, but “Hebrew Bible” is gaining ground. Within the Christian churches “Old Testament” seems likely to persist on both sides of the Atlantic, though even in Christian liturgy some prefer to speak of “readings from the Hebrew Scriptures.” The shift has slightly affected the term *New Testament*, too, since there is little point in that once the term *Old Testament* is abandoned; and it too can sound supersessionist. But there is as yet no agreed alternative. “Early Christian writings” is accurate but does not convey the sense of a fixed canon of texts that is implied in the term *New Testament*.

Some call the two parts of the Christian Bible the “First” and “Second” Testaments, which sounds suitably neutral from a religious perspective, though it is not clear why one should still use the word *Testament* at all in these formulations, given that the reference to two covenants has been abandoned. I think that it will be some time before there is any resolution of these issues. On the face of it the substitution of “Hebrew Bible”

for “Old Testament” seems easy and innocent, but as just pointed out it runs into a certain amount of difficulty once we start to think about it more carefully. The next three sections will explore the difficulty from the three points of view mentioned above: the language of the texts, the existence of ancient translations, and the question of the exact contents of the collection.

THE LANGUAGES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

Most of the “Old Testament” is in Hebrew. Hebrew belongs to the Semitic family of languages, of which the major example in the modern world is Arabic, though there are other important Semitic languages still in use, such as Maltese and the various kinds of Ethiopic. There is a subgroup of Semitic languages called Northwest Semitic, and it is here that Hebrew belongs, along with now-defunct tongues such as Moabite, Phoenician, and Ugaritic. It is the local ancient language of the southern Levant, the area now containing the state of Israel and the Palestinian territories. Of course, Hebrew is not defunct but is the national language of Israel and is also spoken where there are groups of Israelis elsewhere in the world, such as in parts of the United States. Modern Hebrew is a deliberate revival of the ancient language, enriched with grammatical and syntactical borrowings from various European languages and vocabulary from all over the world. But Hebrew had not in fact totally died out even before modern Israel revived it. After the Bible was complete, some rabbis continued to write (and possibly to speak) Hebrew, in the form now known as Mishnaic Hebrew—that is, the language in which the Jewish collection of laws from the first few centuries CE known as the Mishnah is written. Throughout the Middle Ages there continued to be Hebrew speakers both in the land of Israel and in the diaspora communities of Mesopotamia—the descendents of the exiles from the sixth century—as well as in Egypt, where there had long been a Jewish community. Alongside this active use of later forms of Hebrew, the Bible has continued to be read and studied intensively in Hebrew. There has never been a time when Hebrew “died out.”

Even within the Bible itself, however, there is some evidence that the Hebrew language developed over time. There are differences between

the main narrative books such as Samuel and Kings and the considerably later Chronicles, while Ecclesiastes (probably third century BCE) shows signs of changes that would become more apparent in Mishnaic Hebrew. Linguistic shifts such as these can be of some help in dating the biblical books, though there is a danger of circular arguments, since sometimes it is precisely the supposed dates of the books that enable us to trace the linguistic changes. But there is widespread consent that Hebrew literature written after the exile did begin to show differences from earlier works—not only in its vocabulary, with borrowings from Persian and, eventually, from Greek, but also in its grammar and syntax.

But, as pointed out above, one problem in calling the Old Testament “the Hebrew Bible” is that parts of it are not actually in Hebrew at all. Several sections of the books of Daniel and Ezra are written in Aramaic,² which uses the same script as Hebrew but is a distinct language. Because Aramaic had supplanted Hebrew as the language of everyday speech by the second century BCE, and Jesus and his disciples certainly spoke it, it is sometimes thought that Aramaic is a “late” language—even that Hebrew “turned into” Aramaic. But this is not the case. Historically, Aramaic, also a Northwest Semitic language, is a more important language than Hebrew and just as ancient. As Akkadian, the East Semitic chief language of Mesopotamia, declined as an international language in the eighth to seventh centuries BCE, Aramaic came to take its place: Persians communicated with Egyptians through the medium of Aramaic as they had once done via Akkadian and would come to do, from the third century onward, in Greek. Imperial Aramaic, as this lingua franca is known, is close to the “biblical Aramaic” found in Ezra and Daniel.

Hebrew and Aramaic are not mutually comprehensible, but they are very closely related, and anyone who knows one can readily learn the other: they are about as close as German and Dutch, or Spanish and Italian. Once you know which letters in one language correspond to which letters in the other—for example, that words with a *z* in Hebrew will often have a *d* in Aramaic—you can quickly learn to read them both. (Thus “gold” is *zahab* in Hebrew and *dehab* in Aramaic.) Puzzling as it is that Daniel switches from one language to the other in the middle of a chapter, the original readers were probably bilingual and would have had no trouble with the shift. Even the names of the two languages were often confused: when the New Testament refers to words being “in

Hebrew” (Greek *hebraisti*), it means “in Aramaic.” But the title “Hebrew Bible” is certainly somewhat misleading in seeming to imply that the collection of books is in one language only and that that language is what we call Hebrew. We ought to say, more precisely, “the Hebrew and Aramaic Bible.”

Aramaic survives in the version nowadays known as Syriac—a mainly Christian dialect of Aramaic, which is written in an adapted Arabic script and is used in the Syrian churches to this day. It has a rich religious literature, little of it known to most people in the West.

A peculiarity of the writing of both Hebrew and Aramaic needs to be understood if one is to grasp some of the difficulties in reading the Old Testament. This is that in early times only consonants were recorded, with vowels left to be supplied by the reader. This is not as difficult as it sounds, and it persists today in most Modern Hebrew publications, including Israeli newspapers. Where the material is reasonably familiar, the reader can often guess almost instantaneously what vowels are required: no British reader of English would have the slightest difficulty in decoding *Gd sv th Qn* as “God save the Queen.” And this is easier in Semitic languages than in Indo-European ones such as English, since the vowel patterns in words are considerably more predictable.

Even in the earliest Hebrew texts we possess, however, some consonant signs are used also to indicate basic vowels: *y* can be either a consonant or a vowel, just as it can in English, and *w* can stand for *o* or *u* as well as for the consonant we call “double-u.” Thus *dor*, “generation,” can be written simply as *dr*, with the reader supplying the vowel from the context, or more helpfully as *dwr*. This system was already well developed by the time of the Dead Sea Scrolls, which use a lot of these so-called vowel letters to assist the reader, just as also happens in Modern Hebrew.

Later, however, a more sophisticated system of dots and dashes was invented, written above and below the line to create an absolutely unambiguous guide to pronunciation. These “vowel points,” as they are known, were finally codified in the early Middle Ages, and they can be seen in our earliest complete Hebrew Bible, the Leningrad Codex, the work of the scholars known as the Massoretes of Tiberias, whose task was to transmit the Hebrew text in such a way that no one could be in any doubt about its traditional form (*masorah* means “tradition”). In supplying all these vowel signs the Massoretes were not innovating but

simply recording what had come down to them through oral reading of the traditional text, and so it is likely that in most cases the Massoretic Text (MT) reflects much earlier reading traditions—the Leningrad Codex often coincides with the evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls, for example, though it also sometimes differs from it. Partly because the vowel points now do some of the work previously achieved by vowel letters, MT often has fewer vowel letters than the Dead Sea texts—this is technically described by saying that MT often writes “defectively” what the Dead Sea texts record in a “full” way (*defectivum* rather than *plene* spelling, in the traditional Latin terminology).

Nevertheless, the vowel points cannot be regarded as so ancient as the consonantal text, and modern scholars will more often suggest that the Massorettes may have made mistakes in the vowels than that they may have mistransmitted the consonants. As Hebrew has a large number of words that are identical in their consonants but differ in their vowels (like *pan*, *pen*, *pin*, and *pun* in English), this can make a difference to the meaning of the text; however, again as in English, often one vocalization is far likelier than another, and the Massorettes much more often than not got it right. (In English *th pn s mghtr thn th swrd* could conceivably mean “the pun is mightier than the sword” but hardly “the pan” or “the pin”; and in fact we recognize “the pen” as correct partly because the saying then makes more sense and partly, of course, because we probably know it already.) The different age of the consonants and the vowel signs is a reminder, though, that the text of the Bible is not an absolute given but developed over time even after the books were written.

ANCIENT TRANSLATIONS OF THE BIBLE

To call the Old Testament the “Hebrew Bible” may be a bit misleading, given that some of it is in Aramaic, but it does register the fact that it existed in ancient Semitic languages before it became part of the scriptures of the Christian church. In treating as authoritative this collection of books, the church was accepting an already existing body of material, not creating or inventing one itself. The relationship in the new “covenant” the church believed God had entered into with “his people,” and indeed with the human race, through Jesus Christ had always to be re-

lated to a Scripture that already existed. This relationship, sometimes one of continuity but also sometimes one of dialogue or tension, existed from the very beginning of the Christian movement. But another important factor that may give us pause in using the term *Hebrew Bible* for the older collection of Scripture is this: early Christians in many cases read or used the Jewish scriptures not in Hebrew (or Aramaic) at all but, rather, in Greek.

Jesus presumably read the Bible in Hebrew (and Aramaic), and Paul certainly knew the languages and could read them. But all the sayings of Jesus that we have referring to the Old Testament have come down to us in the Gospels in Greek, despite the fact that Aramaic was his daily language; and Paul wrote only in Greek. One explanation would be that Paul and the Gospel writers made their own translations from the Hebrew and Aramaic text of the Bible, but in fact this is both unnecessary and unlikely because a Greek translation already existed.

Our only evidence about its origins lies in a legend preserved in a document called the *Letter of Aristeas*, which tells how Pharaoh Ptolemy II (309–246 BCE) arranged for the Jewish laws (which may mean the Pentateuch or Torah) to be translated into Greek, so that he might understand the laws under which his Jewish subjects lived and so that Jews not fluent in Hebrew might be able to read them. There were seventy-two translators, and by a miracle they all produced the same translation. Their version was thereafter known as the Septuagint (Latin for “Seventy” and sometimes abbreviated LXX). In reality we do not know for sure when and where the Septuagint was produced, but it was definitely between the fourth and the first century BCE and almost certainly in Egypt, where there was the highest concentration of Greek-speaking Jews.

Whether the Pentateuch was indeed the first part of the Bible to be translated is not known, but it is a reasonable conjecture: by this time it was regarded as preeminent among the Jewish Scriptures and was certainly more important for the regulation of Jewish life than other parts of the Bible. But translations of the other biblical books followed, and by the time of Jesus and Paul, in the first half of the first century CE, many Greek-speaking Jews knew their Bible primarily through the Greek translation. Paul was almost certainly bilingual in Hebrew and Greek (and no doubt could also speak Aramaic): he had had the equivalent of a university education. But Jesus himself may have spoken at least some

Greek, even if he could not read it. The Gospel writers were all Greek speakers and very often, like Paul, cite the Bible in Greek according to the LXX version, not in accordance with the original Hebrew or Aramaic.

Thus, whatever the origins of the Greek translation of the Hebrew and Aramaic texts, by the time of the New Testament writers it was already an established fact, and all, or virtually all, of the biblical books were available in Greek—indeed, as we shall go on to see, the Greek version actually contained more books than the Hebrew. In studying the “Hebrew Bible” today scholars therefore need to know Greek as much as they need to know Hebrew, since sometimes the Greek will contain wording that differs from the MT but which may attest an older underlying Hebrew text. In one notable case, the Greek text of the book of Jeremiah is much shorter than the Hebrew, and the evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls suggests that the shorter version may reflect the fact that there was an older edition in Hebrew, which the LXX translators had in front of them. The present Hebrew text is, then, a lengthened version of the original, and the Greek is a better guide to the original book of Jeremiah than the Hebrew we encounter in printed Bibles. We cannot assume that the Hebrew we have is always older than the Greek we have, even though there is no doubt that the books were originally written in Hebrew. Sometimes the “original” text may be represented better by the Greek than by the Hebrew of the MT that has come down to us. For some religious believers, this raises questions of biblical authority: In such cases, which is the *real* Bible? Or is that a meaningless question?

The Greek Bible is assumed by many to be simply a translation of the truly authoritative Hebrew text. But for early Christians, many of whom could not read Hebrew, any authority the Hebrew original possessed was very theoretical, since they only ever encountered the Old Testament in Greek and treated its wording as the authority for faith and life. Since the LXX is at many points a faithful rendering of the Hebrew, so far as we can tell, this may not seem to matter very much. But if one starts to press the *exact* wording of the text, matters become more complicated. To take one of the most famous examples: Isaiah 7:14 refers in the LXX to a virgin becoming pregnant, and this became an important “proof text” for Christians who believed in the virgin birth of Jesus. But the Hebrew word underlying the translation means simply a young

woman. In the original Hebrew the verse therefore contributes nothing to the doctrine: it probably refers to the imminent birth of a son to King Ahaz of Judah. In the Greek, it has wide doctrinal implications. Which text is “authoritative” for the Christian church? The question is hard to answer; but if authority lies with the Greek, then one needs some theory of the inspiration of the Greek translators, a little like that in the *Letter of Aristeas*, perhaps. In modern times the issue has hardly been discussed: most Christians who think about the matter assume that authority lies with the original Hebrew, and modern biblical translations are always made from that, though the evidence of the LXX is allowed to influence decisions in places where it might reflect an earlier Hebrew text. For early Christians, with no access to the Hebrew at all, the matter appeared in a different light.

As Christianity spread from Greek-speaking circles to those where Latin was the everyday language, Latin translations were made—but always from the Greek. It is only with Jerome (347–420) that we encounter a translator who sought to weigh the evidence of the Hebrew text in producing a Latin version, and his translation (traditionally called the Vulgate) may again in places preserve traditional readings in the Hebrew that are older than our MT. The older Latin translations (*vetus Latina*, “old Latin”) cannot help us with the Hebrew but can sometimes point to old traditions in the Greek Bible that are older than the Greek we now possess, in just the same way as the Greek can attest to earlier Hebrew readings. Biblical scholars need to be able to consider Hebrew, Greek, and Latin versions if they are to establish the earliest versions of the biblical books. Even so, to get back to the *original words* written by the authors of the books is no more than a pipe dream. The best we can ever do is to establish what may be the earliest version that can be reconstructed.

THE APOCRYPHA

A further problem is that the Greek Bible contains more books than the Hebrew one. The additional books can be found in English Bibles that contain a section called “The Apocrypha,” which since the Reformation has been understood by Protestants to mean the majority of books either

that never had a Hebrew original (such as the Wisdom of Solomon, composed in Greek) or whose Hebrew original was lost (such as Tobit or Sirach [= Ecclesiasticus], large parts of the original Hebrew of which have now been found). *Apocrypha* means “hidden books,” and in the early church the term was used to describe “secret” books, often those used by sects such as the Gnostics, of which orthodox Christians disapproved; there was also a theory that there were certain divinely inspired books that God had chosen to keep hidden (see 2 Esdr. 14:45–46). The Protestant Reformers borrowed the term to refer to biblical books that were not accepted by the Jews as inspired, which they excluded from the list of books fully approved by the church; some Protestants, such as Lutherans and Anglicans, continued to read them and think highly of them, while others, such as Calvinists, rejected them altogether.

In the early church, as soon as contact with the Hebrew Bible was lost, the books in question were mostly treated as simply part of Scripture: most people did not know that Jews did not accept them or would not have cared if they had known. Early Christian writers quote freely from some of them as if they were wholly on a par with all other biblical books. An awareness that they did not form part of the Jewish “canon” can be found as early as Melito of Sardis, who made a fact-finding journey to the Holy Land to discover Jewish attitudes to Scripture. But in the fifth century a row erupted about them between Jerome and Augustine (354–430). The former, in touch with Jews and, as we have seen, knowing Hebrew, became acutely aware that Christians were using books not accepted in Judaism and not extant in Hebrew, and he argued that they should stop doing so. The latter contended that these books had always been regarded as holy, and should continue to be so regarded, within the church. The matter was tacitly resolved in Augustine’s favor, since the “apocryphal” books continued in use from then on. At the time of the Reformation Jerome’s view of the matter resurfaced and resulted in a move to assert that only the Jewish canon of the Bible should count as the church’s Old Testament. Catholics, however, continued to affirm the inspiration of the Apocrypha, and in Catholic Bibles today they do not appear in a supplementary section but, rather, integrated among the other Old Testament books, standing next to those they most resemble—thus Tobit and Judith are next to Esther, and the Wisdom of Solomon and Ecclesiasticus are next to Proverbs, Job, and Ecclesiastes. Though

they are sometimes referred to as “deuterocanonical,” “belonging to a second order of the canon,” they are treated in both theology and liturgy as entirely on a par with other biblical books. And there the question rests: the extent of the Old Testament canon never seems to be on the agenda for ecumenical discussion, and it is simply accepted that different churches have different Old Testaments. Indeed, the Orthodox churches recognize a few additional books (Psalm 151, 3 and 4 Maccabees, the Prayer of Manasses) that are not even in the Catholic Bible; while the church in Ethiopia has an even more expansive canon of Scripture. Whereas all Christians agree on every detail of the New Testament, the Old Testament remains a gray area.

So far I have written about the “early church,” meaning the church from about the second century onward, in which Greek was the standard language and access to Scripture in Hebrew was barely available to most Christians. But what was the situation if we go back still earlier, into the age of the New Testament? What was the biblical canon (i.e., the authoritative list of scriptural books) for Jesus or Paul or their immediate followers? Here the issues become complicated. It is a natural assumption that Scripture for Jews—and Jesus and Paul were Jews—comprised only the books that exist in Hebrew (and Aramaic) and that the Greek books cannot have been regarded as canonical. But, as we saw, many Jews were bilingual in Hebrew and Greek even in that period, and Jews in Egypt may in many cases have been monolingual in Greek and unable to read the Hebrew books at all: that is why the LXX was made in the first place. So it is not at all a matter of course that Jews would have regarded only the Hebrew books as holy.

An old theory was that the shorter Hebrew canon of Scripture was authoritative in Palestine but the longer Greek one was authoritative in Egypt, and there was sense in such a conjecture. But it now seems likelier that in both areas the Bible, rather than being a tightly defined set of books in which a given book was definitively “in” or “out,” consisted of a central core and a penumbra. The central core contained the Torah or Pentateuch and many of the historical and prophetic books, especially perhaps Isaiah (which is referred to so plentifully in the New Testament), together with the Psalms. The penumbra consisted of various other books, including some that are now in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., Job, Ecclesiastes) and others that are only in the Greek Bible (e.g., Wisdom of

Solomon, Judith). Some Jews revered some of the penumbral books more than others, but there had been no definite rulings on the exact extent of the canon. It may be that some Jewish groups were clearer than others about these questions. It has recently been argued that the Pharisees tended toward the Hebrew canon and were followed in this by the Jewish historian Josephus; while the Dead Sea community, for example, probably had a more expansive Scripture, which included books such as *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*, which did not in the end make it into the main Jewish or Christian canons (though *1 Enoch* is canonical in Ethiopia).

If this is broadly correct, then the word *canon* itself may be a bit anachronistic for the very early period. Most Jewish communities knew and revered the main books that are now in the Hebrew Bible, but they did not positively reject other books, and the boundary between scripture and nonscripture was not a clear one. (New Testament writers nowhere discuss which books they regarded as Scripture; we can only work it out by seeing which books they cite.) Though there is no record of any formal canonization process in Judaism, it is perfectly clear by the time of the Mishnah (second and third centuries CE) that the Bible was taken to include the books that are now in the Hebrew canon: only they are cited as scriptural. (This accords with what Melito established.) Very occasionally we hear of discussions of canonicity: the main example is Sirach (Ecclesiasticus), which was widely approved of but regarded as too recent to be part of Scripture. Some think (though I disagree) that there were disputes about Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs. But no one ever *decided* that Genesis, say, should be regarded as Scripture: it had been so for as long as memory stretched back. Christians in later times were much more prone than Jews to discuss the issue of what belonged in the Bible, but even among them decisions about the canon were mostly a matter of endorsing what had come down from the past, not creating a canon from first principles, as it were. And doubts were only ever expressed about books on the margins; there was a very large fixed core.

To return to the issue of terminology: If we use “Hebrew Bible,” does that include or exclude the books some call Apocrypha? On the face of it, it excludes them, since they exist in Greek, not Hebrew. Or worse still, it includes any such books for which an original Hebrew turns up, as it did for Sirach, but excludes Wisdom of Solomon, which is plainly Greek in its whole conception and never existed in Hebrew. In practice, bibli-

cal scholars who say that they study “the Hebrew Bible” are quite likely to be interested in the “Apocrypha,” and indeed one cannot be a biblical scholar without knowing about these books. But “Hebrew Bible” is, then, a very inexact way of describing the subject of study. “Old Testament” also has the drawback that it does not clearly indicate whether or not the apocryphal/deuterocanonical books are included. In the end there is no ideal term, but of the two under consideration, *Hebrew Bible* is the more restrictive and less informative, even though it avoids the danger of supersessionism, which we have seen to be a major concern and which probably tips the scales for most scholars today.

It is sometimes said that, whatever the theoretical position, in practice New Testament writers only appeal at all substantially to the books now in the Hebrew canon, not to those in the Apocrypha. In terms of actual quotation this is generally true, though there is the remarkable fact that the Letter of Jude quotes from *1 Enoch*, which, as we have seen, is not even in the larger Greek canon as that has come down to us.³ (Arguments that it is not quoted “as Scripture” are usually special pleading on behalf of a conservative theory of the canon.) But Paul shows extensive knowledge of the Wisdom of Solomon in his argument about human sin in the first chapter of Romans—or at least of something very like it; and when he discusses the origins of sin as lying with Adam, he cannot be dependent on the Hebrew Bible alone (which never reflects on Adam’s sin after Genesis 3) but, rather, more on the traditions to be found in Wisd. of Sol. 1:12–16 and Sir. 25:24, which clearly identify Adam and Eve as the source of universal human sinfulness and death in exactly the same way as Paul does. On a traditional understanding of the matter, we should have to say that Paul was deeply indebted to some noncanonical books. But a better way is probably to say that Paul knew many Jewish books, some nearer the center of Scripture than others, which he drew on for his ideas. Unless we have a heavy personal investment in knowing exactly which books are to be counted as “The Bible,” we can best express this by saying that for Paul, as for many early Jews and Christians, many books that were known to be ancient exercised a certain authority and influence. The question “Is this book part of the canon of Scripture or not?” was not one that exercised their minds: no one had yet formulated it in those terms. For the modern “biblical scholar” any books from ancient Israel are similarly of interest and concern, and

it does not matter very much whether or not they were “canonical.” Accordingly it probably also does not matter much for the discipline of biblical scholarship whether we call the subject of study “Hebrew Bible,” “Old Testament,” “First Testament,” or something else. Within religious communities, however, it may matter a good deal; and finding a term that will not be offensive to other religious groups is an important aim.

THE HEBREW BIBLE/OLD TESTAMENT IN JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY

Both Judaism and Christianity regard the Old Testament/Hebrew Bible as possessing special authority, which is implied by calling the collection of books “Scripture.” But in both cases the authority is not exactly like that of a legal document or constitution or of a creed or “confession” in the Christian case (such as the Augsburg Confession for Lutherans or the Westminster Confession for Presbyterians). In both communities the authority of the Old Testament is subject to various complicated checks and balances, different in character in the two cases and different, indeed, in different branches of the two religions.

In Judaism the books of the Hebrew Bible are organized differently than what is familiar from the Christian Old Testament. There are three divisions: the Law or Torah (the Pentateuch); the Prophets (which includes not only what everyone calls the prophetic books, such as Isaiah and Hosea, but also the “historical books,” Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings); and the Writings, a miscellaneous section including Psalms, Proverbs, Job, and Ezra–Nehemiah but also Chronicles, which does not therefore appear alongside the other historical books as it does in the Christian Bible. The threefold division is reflected in the name sometimes used in modern Judaism for the Bible, “Tanakh,” an acronym from the initial letters of *Torah*, *Nebi'im*, and *Ketubim*, the Hebrew words for Law, Prophets, and Writings. It is possible that the threefold division reflects the historical realities of “canonization” and that in the Greek Bible, which is arranged more according to the types of literature (history, wisdom, prophecy), an ancient order has been disturbed; or it may be that the Jewish and Christian arrangements are roughly contemporary and simply represent different ways of ordering the material. If the

Jewish system is older, however, it may indicate that the Pentateuch was the first section to be universally accepted as holy scripture in ancient Israel (possibly as early as the fourth century BCE), and some think that the Prophets came next and then finally the Writings, which were still fluid into the first century BCE or even CE. On the model suggested above, it is perhaps more likely that the Prophets and Writings were both still in flux down almost into the age of the New Testament and that the division between them occurred in rabbinic times (after the end of the first century CE). This may be suggested by the fact that the New Testament seems to attest more to a twofold distinction (“the law and the prophets”) and that early rabbinic sayings also differentiate the Law from the rest but do not point to a division between Prophets and Writings. But as things now stand, the threefold division is regarded as standard in Judaism, and printed Hebrew Bibles, following the earliest evidence for the MT in the Aleppo and Leningrad codices, adopt this pattern.

Sometimes it has been suggested that the threefold division reflects the contents of the books. The Torah is the word of God spoken directly by him; the Prophets represent God’s word mediated through human vehicles; the Writings are human reflection on the word of God. This scheme works more or less well in practice, but with some inconsistencies: Deuteronomy, for example, within the Torah, is presented very much as mediated through Moses, while, on the other hand, there are places in Job—in the Writings—where God is represented as speaking directly. However, it is very unlikely to be historically the reason for the division: it is more a homiletic account of the given fact, trying to make it fruitful for religious faith.

The distinctions are definitely functional liturgically in Judaism. In the synagogue liturgy, the whole Torah is read through annually in large sections; and to each section there corresponds a second reading, always from the Prophets, though they are read only very selectively. Five of the Writings (Lamentations, Esther, Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes, and Ruth) are read at various festivals, and parts of the Psalms are used regularly in worship, but other books in the Writings do not appear in the liturgy at all. The reading of the Torah is surrounded by ceremonial, and the scrolls from which it is read must be handwritten and occupy the holiest place in the synagogue; the other scriptural books can be read from simple

printed editions. Just when these usages all became established is not known for certain, but in modern times they are certainly more or less universal in Judaism and attest to the functional importance of the threefold division.

Does the division have any importance for interpretation? It is overwhelmingly the Torah that matters for questions of *halakhah*, that is, for how life is to be lived. Texts from the Prophets and Writings may be adduced in support, but the Torah reigns supreme. In the Mishnah, material from the Writings, especially from Proverbs, is rather more plentiful than that from the Prophets, but overall in Jewish texts, especially the two Talmuds, all of the Prophets and Writings certainly contribute to rabbinic discussions, and in principle any text can clinch an argument, whichever section it comes from. Furthermore, the canon is clearly “closed”: that is, there is no fluidity about which texts count as Scripture, since only those from the Hebrew Bible are ever cited with the formula “as it is written” or “as it is said.”

But to speak of the authority of the Bible in rabbinic discussion can give a misleading impression. In Talmudic discourse—and even in the Midrash, where texts are commented on serially—the biblical text is appealed to as an authority, but the rulings and arguments presented often exist in a world more controlled in reality by what is called the *Oral Torah*—that is, the accumulated teachings and speculations of generations of rabbis. True, every opinion must be traced back to a scriptural text; but it is not often the biblical text itself that calls the tune. In theory, the written Torah has absolute jurisdiction; in practice, it is the accumulation of traditional interpretation that determines what is taught. Citations from the Torah (or from the rest of the Bible) come in to underscore what is taught, but they are not its true origin.

Thus there is a paradox, a paradox that tends to characterize many religions that appeal to fixed scriptures. Precisely because the scriptures are so central, they tend to be read in such a way as to endorse what is already believed as part of the religion in question. Yet that religion would not be what it is without the scriptures. Judaism would not be Judaism without the Hebrew Bible, from which in many ways it derives. Yet it reads the Bible in accordance with norms that themselves are postbiblical. As religious believers, we read our sacred texts in the light of what we already believe, yet what we already believe does to some degree arise from those same sacred texts.

Christianity is no exception to this rule. In desperate attempts to extract the doctrine of the Trinity from the Bible, for example, one sees the same tug-of-war between what the text appears to mean and the meaning that the religion it supports needs to derive from it. Traditional Catholicism has in some measure avoided this problem by stressing that the essence of the faith derives from tradition rather than from Scripture, though that solution then takes its own revenge by leading people to read the documents of the tradition—creeds and bulls and encyclicals—in the same “creative” way, so as to make sure that they speak with the voice of later orthodoxy. And even then it has often had to interpret the Bible in accordance with tradition, since it has not been willing simply to abandon the idea that the Bible is authoritative, even if functionally it occupies a more secondary role than it apparently does in Judaism. But Protestantism, which has traditionally invested all authority in the Bible, has been very strongly constrained to read all it wanted to believe out of the Bible and has done so by reading at least some of it into the Bible in the first place.

Christianity, however, has a more complicated relationship than Judaism to the Old Testament in particular. There are varieties of Protestantism, and, indeed, of traditional Catholicism, for which the Old Testament is seen as exactly on a par with the New in terms of its authority. In principle, for them, the laws in Leviticus are as binding on Christians as they are on Jews, though in cases such as the food laws they tend to be interpreted metaphorically rather than literally. But most kinds of Christianity see the relation of the faith to the Old Testament more dialectically. The Old Testament presents the basic picture of God to which Christians are committed—as one, as the creator, as the deity whose chose Israel, as the preserver of all humanity; yet in the light of the revelation in Christ some of what it affirms needs modification, and some is perhaps even abrogated. Thus many Christians would think that the more vengeful aspects of the Old Testament God have to be moderated in the light of what is revealed of God in Christ, and most would see some of at least the so-called ceremonial laws as no longer applicable in the Christian dispensation.

How far down this road Christians should be prepared to go is a matter of opinion. The mainstream churches have always rejected “Marcionism,” the belief (attributed to Marcion of Sinope, ca. 85–160 CE), that in Christ the Old Testament is revealed as the scriptures of a hostile

and alien God. Yet many (and perhaps especially in Lutheranism) have contrasted the Testaments to the detriment of the Old, rather than seeing the Old as flowing seamlessly into the New (as Calvinists are more likely to do). How much these various approaches can be justified is perhaps one of the biggest issues dividing Christians today. It bears on all manner of social and moral issues, not least the (among Christians) hugely controversial area of homosexuality, where so many of the biblical prohibitions (though not all of them) occur in Old Testament texts. Biblical conservatives regard any attempt to give the Old Testament a second rank in Christianity as a form of “liberalism”; those whose tradition has always done this regard those who equalize the Testaments as fundamentalists (the ancient church would probably have called them “Judaizers,” a term of abuse that thankfully is no longer used). Though the interpretation of the Old Testament, like the question of its exact contents, is seldom on the agenda at ecumenical conferences, in truth it is a very contentious issue. The Old Testament’s place in Christianity is a complex one, entirely unlike its unproblematic status in Judaism, and large theological issues hinge upon it.

NOTES

1. The “Song of Deborah” in Judges 5 is widely thought to go back into the eleventh century BCE, and some think that there is a very early “core” to the Song of Moses in Exodus 15. On the other hand, it is most unlikely that the Ten Commandments, for example, are earlier than the time of the Hebrew monarchies, since they reflect a settled, agrarian lifestyle, not at all the desert milieu from which they purport to come.
2. Ezra 4:8–6:18, 7:12–26; and Dan. 2:4b–7:28.
3. See Jude 14–15.

FURTHER READING

On the textual history of the Hebrew Bible, see the full discussion in Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 3rd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012). On its development through time, a good guide is John J. Collins, *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004).

For further reflections on the question of terminology (Old Testament or Hebrew Bible?), see John J. Collins, *Hebrew Bible or Old Testament? Studying the Bible in Judaism and Christianity* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1990); J.F.A. Sawyer, “Combating Prejudices about the Bible and Judaism,” *Theology* 94 (1991): pp. 269–78; J. A. Sanders, “First Testament and Second,” *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 17 (1987): pp. 47–49; R.W.L. Moberly, *The Old Testament of the Old Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992).

For the character and development of the Hebrew language, an excellent guide is Angel Sáenz-Badillos, *A History of the Hebrew Language*, J. F. Elwolde, trans. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

On the Greek Bible, an accessible guide is T. M. Law, *When God Spoke Greek: The Septuagint and the Making of the Christian Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).

Canonical questions are discussed in L. M. McDonald and J. A. Sanders, *The Canon Debate* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002); and J. Barton, *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile*, 2nd ed. (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 2007). For the question of the Pharisaic canon, see T. Lim, *The Formation of the Jewish Canon* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2013). For a general overview of the variety in the Old Testament canon, see J. Barton, “The Old Testament Canons,” in J. Schaper and J. Carleton Paget, eds., *The New Cambridge History of the Bible*, vol. 1, *From the Beginnings to 600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 145–64.

Index of Subjects



- 1 Enoch*, 16; citation of in Jude, 17
2 Maccabees, on creation, 289–90
- Abrabanel, Isaac, 445
- Abraham, 44; covenant of with Abimelech, 316; death of, 303; God's covenant with, 318–19; hospitality of, 72; and the “insiders” and “outsiders” trope, 30–31
- acrostics, in the Old Testament, 227, 232n17
- Adam, as a proper noun, 295, 310n4
- Aeschylus, 259–60
- afterlife, the, 304; the final resurrection and the defeat of death, 304; and Sheol, 304
- Ahab, 104n57
- Ahaz, 35, 143
- Ahura Mazda, 231–32n14
- Akedah, the, postbiblical interpretations of, 423–24
- “Akhenaten's Great Hymn,” 97
- Akkadian, 8; and the “dead dog” idiom, 95; as an East Semitic language, 8
- Aleppo Codex, 3, 19, 534, 541
- Alexander the Great, 4; death of, 151
- Ammissaduka, edict of, 179n23
- Amos, book of, 148, 149; date of, 4; social critique of, 146, 147, 308
- ancient Near East, 87, 88, 100–101, 562–63 (map); as the context of the biblical narratives, 113–20; the term *Near East*, 87. *See also* ancient Near East, law codes of
- ancient Near East, law codes of, 174, 175–76; blessings and imprecations in international treaty law, 177–78n8; and kings' authority to legislate, 162–63; the “monumental” position on, 176; the “practical” position on, 176; the “scribal-wisdom” position on, 176; separation between “the written law” and the law that was actually practiced in day-to-day affairs, 175. *See also specific law codes*
- Anglicanism, view of the Apocrypha, 14
- Anglo-Saxon legal system, and common law, 178n15
- animals, categorization of in the Old Testament as permitted or forbidden (for food): the emphasis placed on the pig as the most negative forbidden land animal, 381–82; forbidden air animals, 382; forbidden land animals, 381; forbidden water animals, 382; permitted air animals, 382; permitted land animals, 381; permitted water animals, 382; sacrificable animals, 391–92; the unbridgeability of the oppositional categories, 384
- anthropology, 406
- Antiochus IV Epiphanes, 4, 289–90
- Apocrypha, the, 13–18; in Catholic Bibles, 14; as “deuterocanonical,” 15; in Ethiopian Orthodox Bibles, 15; as “hidden books,” 14; Jewish view of, 14; and the New Testament writers, 17; in Orthodox Bibles, 15; Protestant view of, 13–14. *See also specific apocryphal books*
- Aquila, 537, 540
- Arad, 367–68
- Aramaic, 8, 11; Imperial Aramaic, 8; as a Northwest Semitic language, 8; relation of to Hebrew, 8–9; Syriac as a Christian dialect of, 9; writing of, 9
- archaeology, 88–89, 446; and Finkelstein's “low chronology,” 40; the lack of archaeological evidence on the united monarchy of David and Solomon, 38–43; and monumental inscriptions, administrative documents, and other epigraphic artifacts from the empires of ancient West Asia, 35–38, 43–44; and the so-called Bible-and-spade approach to biblical history, 26
- Ark, the, 210, 370; allusions to in Psalms, 207, 207–8, 210; disappearance of after the exile, 210
- Asherah, 94, 249; Asherah and Yhwh, 94, 249–52; decline in devotion to among Northwest Semites, 249; as “mother of the gods,” 251; symbol of (a wooden pole or tree), 94, 171, 249, 250

- Ashur, 253, 261
Assurbanipal, 35, 133
Assyria, 157; parallels with Assyrian military narratives in Joshua, 119–20
Astruc, Jean, 122
Aton, 231n8
Atrahasis, 116, 255, 256, 257, 259, 276, 318; date of, 116; use of by the biblical writers, 117–18
Augustine, 463, 472; on the Apocrypha, 14

Baal, 208, 231n6, 231n12; association of with Mount Zaphon, 370, 559; local manifestations of, 239
Baal Cycle, 184, 255, 255–56, 256, 257
Babylonian Empire, 568–69 (map)
“Babylonian Theodicy,” 192
Balaam, 134, 139, 142, 150; inscription of (in Deir ‘Alla), 134, 135
Ba’lu, 281, 282, 283
Bellarmine, Robert, 431, 434–35, 435, 436, 450
ben Hayyim, Jacob, 538
Ben Sira, book of, 14, 182, 201, 538; the covenant in, 329; on creation, 288–89; critique of Ecclesiastes in, 288; debates over the canonicity of, 16; “Praise of the Fathers” in, 152; prologue of, 152, 199, 200; use of Genesis in, 298–99; wisdom in, 199–200
Bethel, 365; and the Bethel exodus formula, 365; Book of the Twelve’s depiction of, 365; as a chief rival to the Temple in Jerusalem, 364; Judahite depictions of, 365
Bible, the, literary approaches to, 497; the Bible in literary and cultural criticism, 458–61; the study of the Bible *and* literature, 471–72; the study of the Bible *as* literature, 455–58, 470–71; the study of the Bible’s theatrical qualities, 464; the study of biblical narrative, 461–63; the study of biblical poetics, 463–64. *See also* feminist biblical criticism; postcolonial criticism; postmodernism; queer criticism
Bible, the, study of: diachronic study, 89–90; synchronic study, 89–90
Bible and Culture Collective, 468–69, 478
Bible translation, 546–47; as a complex and evolving art, 554; and the decision on the form of the text to be translated, 548; the eclectic nature of modern translations when confronted with obscure passages, 549; translation as a “carrying over” (translating) of meaning from one linguistic world or culture into another, 547; translations based on the MT, 548; why new Bible translations continue to be needed, 547. *See also* Bible translation, comparative analysis of four English translations (JPS, NRSV, REB, NABRE)
Bible translation, comparative analysis of four English translations (JPS, NRSV, REB, NABRE): passages where the MT’s text appears to be corrupt, 549–50; passages where the MT’s text appears to be secondary, 550–51; passages where the MT’s reading has been changed for ideological motives, 551–52; passages where the MT’s text is not problematic, 553; passages where the MT’s text is relatively coherent but gives rise to varied modern renderings or interpretations, 552–53
Bible versions: Coverdale Bible, 470; Jewish Publication Society Bible (JPS), 549; King James Bible, 412–13, 458–59, 470–71, 472; London Polyglott Bible, 435; New American Bible, Revised Edition (NABRE), 549; New English Bible, 458; New Revised Standard Version (NRSV), 549; Revised English Bible (REB), 549; Revised Version, 456. *See also* Bible translation, comparative analysis of four English translations (JPS, NRSV, REB, NABRE)
Biblia Hebraica Quinta (BHQ), 542–44; characterizations included in the apparatus of, 544; as a diplomatic edition of the Leningrad Codex, 542, 542–44; general criteria for the selection of cases in, 544; single text-critical apparatus of, 544; volumes in print, 542
Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia, 413, 538
Black Obelisk, 35
blood: connection of with the divine, 396–97; as food for God and no one else, 384–85; as forbidden for food, 395; importance of in purity and the sacrificial cult, 384; as “the life,” 384; meat’s retention of, 384, 385; and the milk and meat/blood category, 383–86, 387; as negative and polluting outside the body, 384, 395; as opposite in quality to milk, 384; the prohibition of blood consumption, 384–85, 395; role of in the sacrifice of animals, 385, 395–96; as a source of impurity, 395

- Bomberg, Daniel, 538
Book of Jashar, 225
Book of Jubilees, the covenant in, 329
“Bullet the Blue Sky” (U2), 422
- Cairo Codex, 534
- Calvinism: view of the Apocrypha, 14; view of the two Testaments, 22
“canon,” in the age of the New Testament, 15–17; “canon” as anachronistic for this early period, 16; the central core, 15; the penumbra, 15–16
- Cappel, Louis, 435
- Catholicism: reliance on the Vulgate, 548; and tradition, 21; view of the Apocrypha, 14
cherubs (*kerubim*), 251; association of with Yhwh, 251
children: child abandonment, 72; importance of for continuity of life after death, 301–2; orphans, 72; social value of, 71
- Christianity, 241. *See also* Catholicism; Christianity, and the Old Testament; Orthodoxy; Protestantism
- Christianity, and the Old Testament, 20–22, 491–94; the complexity of the relationship compared to that of Judaism, 21; the Old Testament as a construct of Judaism and Christianity, 489–90; reception of Psalms in, 228–30.
- Chronicles, books of, 112, 224; as the biblical forerunner to the Rewritten Scripture genre, 417; date of, 129; formation of, 128–29; as an interpretation of Samuel–Kings, 128–29; as a rewriting of the Enneateuch, 128; use of psalms in, 228
- Chronistic History, 127
- clans, towns, and tribes, and religious space and structures, 356, 360–64; city gates, 362; the cult complex on Mount Ebal, 362; cultic rooms, 361; high places, 363; sacrificial feasts, 360–61; the temple at Hazor, 361–62; threshing floors, 363–64
- Clement of Alexandria, 330
- colonialism, 516–18; propaganda disseminated by, 517; use of the Bible to undergird its imperial designs and legitimate its expansionist agenda, 26, 516–17
- covenants, biblical, 313, 315–17; the Abrahamic covenant (Gen. 15, 17), 318–19; basic features of, 316–17; in Ben Sira, 329; *berit* as the bond of relationship, 317; “breaking” the covenant motif, 319; and the concept of covenantal meal, 394, 395, 396, 400n11; the “covenant formula,” 319, 329; the covenant with the patriarchs, 319; the Davidic covenant, 325–26; in the Dead Sea Scrolls, 329–30; the divine covenant in Psalms and wisdom literature, 328–29; the “eternal covenant,” 318, 325, 326, 330–31, 336n44; the “everlasting covenant,” 307, 317, 319; in Ezekiel, 328; as following crises, 331; and friendship, 316; historical evaluation of, 330–31; in Hosea, 328; in Isaiah, 327; Israel’s breaking of the covenant as an explanation for the exile, 29, 31, 330; in Jeremiah, 327; laws as the stipulation of the old covenant, 168; in Malachi, 328; and marriage, 316; the Moab covenant (Deuteronomy), 322–25, 327; the new covenant (Jer. 31) and other prophetic transformations, 5, 10, 326–28, 330; in the New Testament, 330; the Noahic covenant (Gen. 9), 317–18; and obedience to commandments, 319; the old covenant, 5; as part of the ancient Near Eastern tradition of elaborate treaties, 313–14; political pacts at the level of diplomacy and international law, 316; in Psalms, 328; in the Qumran writings, 329–40; and redefinition of the social status of the parties involved, 316; the Sinai covenant (Exod. 19–24), 319–21, 320 (figure); theological evaluation of, 331; “to cut” (*krt*) a covenant, 317, 325; in Zechariah, 328
- Coverdale, Miles, 470
- creation, 273–78; *bārā’* (“to create”) as a central concept in Genesis 1, 277; and Chaos, 275, 277–78; the *creatio ex nihilo* concept, 275; the Creator-creature distinction, 274–75; the divine rest on the seventh day, 274; eight works of allotted to six days, 273; *Enuma Elish* as a conceptual model of, 117, 277–78; of the first human pair, 278–79; as “good” (*tōb*), 273; of humanity “as his [God’s] image” (*bēselem*), 273, 273–74, 297–98; light as the first creation, 273, 274; and natural science, 271–72; new creation, 284–85; the Priestly account of, 369; in Psalms, 281–84; and the rest of God, 274; and theology, 271–72; the two creation accounts, 121, 298; in wisdom literature, 285–90; the work of God (*mēlā kā*) in, 274

- Creation of Man* (Marc Chagall), 422
cult stands, 250; in Ta'anakh, 250–51, 251–52, 358
cultural history, 411
Cylinders of Gudea, 366
Cyrus, 4
Cyrus Cylinder, 43; as an example of ancient Persian propaganda, 43
- Dan, 365–66; as a chief rival to the Temple in Jerusalem, 364; foundation story of, 365; as a pilgrimage site for the Israelite tribal collective, 365–66; sacred complex in, 365–66; Tel Dan, 365
- Daniel, book of, 112–13, 129, 212; Aramaic sections in, 8; Daniel as a wise man in, 198; date of, 5; in the Hebrew canon, 142; interpretation of the prophets in, 152; as a prophetic book, 142; reinterpretation of Jeremiah's prophecy in, 415; "son of man" in, 295; use of ancient mythology as a literary device in, 231n4; wisdom in, 201
- Darius I, 150
- daughters, inheritance of, 178n16; Zelophehad's daughters, 169, 178n16
- David: biblical stories linking David with Bethlehem, 360–61; covenant of with Jonathan, 316; as an exemplar of piety, 213; as the founder of the Judaeen dynasty, 140; God's covenant with, 325–26; and "House of David" on the Tel Dan inscription, 42–43; parallels of with Zimri-Lim, 120; and the psalms, 228. *See also* united monarchy of David and Solomon
- Day of Atonement, 370, 396, 397; and the scapegoat ritual, 396–97
- Dead Sea Scrolls, 3, 12, 158, 229, 415–16, 533, 534–37; 4Q380, 227; 4Q381, 227; 4Q416, 202; 4QBeatitudes (4Q525), 201–2; 4QInstruction, 202; 4QMMT, 152; 4QWiles of the Wicked Woman (4Q184), 201–2; 11QPs^a, 227, 227–28; "Apostrophe to Zion," 227; the "book of the Giants" (4Q530), 115; the covenant in, 329–30; date of, 415; Deuteronomy, Isaiah, and Psalms as the most attested biblical entities in, 535; exegetical techniques used in, 416; fragmentary form of, 6536; "Hymn to the Creator," 227; and the Leningrad Codex, 10; *plenum* spelling in, 10; precanonical textual fluidity of, 533, 537; psalms scrolls, 223; and pseudepigraphal books, 16; reflection of a compilation of sacred writings that was still open, 536; textual pluralism of, 535–36; "Thanksgiving Psalms," 227; use of biblical texts for different purposes in, 436–37; use of psalms in, 229; use of so-called vowel letters in, 9
- death, 66–67, 302–5; association of with dust or soil, 299; and burial practices, 66; corpses as unclean and as sources of contamination, 66, 387, 389; the dead being gathered to their ancestors, 67, 75n12; as descending into Sheol, 304; and the Hebrew stem *mūt* ("to die"), 302; household death and burial rituals, 357, 359–60; the impure as defined by death, 387, 389; interpretation of in the Old Testament, 67; matter-of-fact descriptions of biological death, 302–3; metaphors portraying or personifying death, 302; premature or untimely death, 303–4; rituals of mourning for the dead, 303; and Sheol, 67; and traditional African societies, 66–67
- deconstruction, 468–69
- Deuteronomistic History, 124–27; and the Cross school, 125; and a Deuteronomistic "library" in the Temple, 127; Deuteronomy-Joshua as a "counterhistory," 126–27; and the idea of a multilayered edition of the Deuteronomistic History, 126; Noth's theory of, 125; Samuel-Kings and Josiah as a new David, 127; and the Smend school, 125–26
- Deuteronomy, book of, 110, 213; as the "book of the *torah*" found during Josiah's reign, 325; cult centralization in, 126, 165; date of, 4; deviations from ancient Near Eastern patterns in, 322, 324; impact of on ethnicity, 62; links to Joshua-Kings, 124; as the Moab covenant, 322–25; parallels with Assyrian vassal treaties in, 126–27; as the "Scroll of the Law," 367, 375n40; social function of, 75n6; strategies of reader communication in, 322–24; wisdom in, 198; the writing and remembering of the past as a distinctly religious activity of social consolidation in, 28–29
- Diatessaron, 123
- Dispute between a Man and His Ba*, 197
- divine beings, in the Old Testament, 239–40, 240–42; the divine retinue and Yhwh contrasted with pagan gods, 255–63; humans and divine beings, 256

- divine rest, in the ancient Near East, 275–77;
divine rest as the highest good, 275; and
humanity's duty to care for the gods, 276;
as proof of power, 275–76
- Documentary Hypothesis, 122–23, 164, 494;
abandonment of, 124; and the Deuterono-
mist (D), 122, 164, 494; and the Elohist (E),
122, 130n12, 164, 494; modification of,
123; and the Priestly source (P), 122, 164,
369–71, 494; and the Yahwist (J), 122, 164,
494
- Ecclesiastes, book of, 182, 193, 194–95, 202;
on creation, 286, 287–88; date of, 5, 310n10;
on the meaning of life and what it is to be
human, 296; and Qohelet, 195, 296; the
recovery of meaning in, 197; and Solomon,
195, 296; “vanity” (*hebel*) in, 196; and
wisdom, 195–97
- Ecclesiasticus. *See* Ben Sira, book of
- Eden, 44
- Egypt, 87, 88, 100–101; Egyptian literature, 97;
Egyptian records, 95–97
- El, 118, 209; association of with Mount Zaphon,
209; El Elyon, 209; identification of Yhwh
with in the patriarchal narratives, 118
- Elephantine Papyrus, 76n14; “Document of
Wifehood,” 311n20
- Elijah, 140–41; as a contender for the First
Commandment, 141; the name *Elijah* (“My
God is Yhwh”), 141
- Elisha, 140–41
- Emar, 93; limited kingship in, 93
- Enlightenment, the, 485, 486
- Enoch, 183
- Enuma Elish*, 116–17, 212, 254, 255, 256, 257,
258, 261, 275, 281; as a conceptual model
for the biblical creation account, 277–78;
date of, 116; divine rest in, 275–76; use of
by the biblical writers, 117–18
- Epic of Creation*. *See* *Enuma Elish*
- Epic of Gilgamesh*, 91, 114–16; date of, 91,
114; extant copies of, 91; fragments and
mentions of in the ancient Near East,
115–16; mention of in the “book of the
Giants” (4Q530), 115; and the scribe
Shin-leqi-unninni, 114; standard version
of, 114–15; use of by the biblical writers,
116, 117–18
- Esarhaddon, 35, 133; Succession Treaties (also
Vassal Treaties) of, 314–15, 332n3
- Eshnunna, laws of, 95, 173, 174
- Esther, book of, 113, 129, 212; date of, 5, 129;
as a Diaspora novella, 129; popularity of,
129; wisdom in, 198
- ethics, sources of, 349–53: God and his explicit
moral statements (God as the moral
system), 349–50, 352–53; *imitatio dei*,
351–52; innate universal moral norms,
350–51; observation of and knowledge
about the world (“natural law”), 351
- ethics in ancient Israel, study of, 338–40
- ethics of the Old Testament, study of, 338–40.
See also genres, biblical
- ethnicity, 60–63, 65; distinguishing features
of, 56; in Ezra-Nehemiah, 62–63; impact of
Deuteronomy on, 62; and instrumentalists,
60; in Nahum, 75n5; the overlap between
ethnicity and kinship, 75n7; and primordial-
ists, 60; in Ruth, 63
- exile, the, 4; and the “crisis of wisdom,” 193;
the exiles as a “Charter Group,” 62; as pun-
ishment from Yhwh for Israel's breaking of
the covenant, 29, 31, 330; reference to in
Psalms, 211–12; and the remnant, 31–32
- exodus, the, 44; date of, 96; as a foundation
myth of “outside” origins, 34; historicity
of, 33–34, 95–96; and the “insiders” and
“outsiders” trope, 30–31; as a theme in
liberation theology, 514, 515
- Exodus, book of, 109; date of, 4
- Ezekiel, book of, 151, 211; the collection of
laws composed by Ezekiel in, 160; the
covenant in, 328; date of, 4; new divine
activities in, 284; as a sort of midrash on
the prophets, 151; use of *'ādām* in, 295
- Ezra: bilingual reading and rendering of
Scripture by, 540; in the LXX, 128;
popularity of, 128; in the Vulgate, 128
- Ezra-Nehemiah, book of, 112, 212; Aramaic
sections in Ezra, 8; date of, 128; ethnicity
in, 62–63; and the “Ezra narrative,” 128;
formation of, 128; and the “Nehemiah
memoir,” 128
- fall, the, 279–81; and Chaos as a partner of
evil, 279, 280
- Far East, 87
- feminist biblical criticism, 464–66, 508, 509–13;
on the book of Ruth, 524; criticism of by
African American (womanist) and Hispanic
American (*mujerista*) women's groups,

- 512–13; impetus of from social and political movements promoting justice and equality, 511; increasing recognition of the importance of integrating non-Western approaches into biblical exegesis, 513; and the rise of the so-called second wave of feminism, 509; stances of toward the Bible, 511; and *The Woman's Bible*, 510
- Fertile Crescent, 561
- flood, the, 281; *Atrahasis* as a conceptual model of, 116, 117–18; *Epic of Gilgamesh* as a conceptual model of, 117; the two flood accounts, 117, 120
- food rules complex, 380–86, 399, 401n13; and the bringing together of food rules, purity, and sacrifice, 380; food rules concerning mixtures of milk and meat/blood, 380–81, 383–86; food rules concerning types of animals (those that can be eaten and those that are forbidden), 380–83, 384; the pig as emblematic of the system of food rules, 381–82, 387, 390. *See also* animals, categorization of in the Old Testament as permitted or forbidden (for food)
- foreigners/foreignness: Greek terms for, 55–56; Hebrew terms for, 55
- Gemara, 419
- Genesis, book of, 109; date of, 4; genealogies and lists of descendants in, 302; the Joseph story in, 129, 198; legal texts in, 162; use of *ʾādām* in the early chapters of, 295
- genres, biblical, 340–41, 348–49. *See also* law; narrative; poetry; prophecy; wisdom literature
- Gezer, 37, 38, 39, 40
- Glassius, Salomon, 436–37, 450
- Gnostics, 14
- gods. *See* divine beings, in the Old Testament
- Greek, 11, 11–12
- Greek religion, classical, 241
- Grotius, Hugo, 437–40, 440–41, 441, 446
- Habakkuk, book of, 151
- Haggai, book of, 150, 212
- Halevi, Yehuda, 463
- Hammurabi, laws of, 167, 173, 174, 255, 311n21, 344; prologue to, 258
- Hananiah, 137
- Harper's Song from the Tomb of King Intef*, 194–95
- Hazor, 37, 38, 39, 40
- Hebrew, 7, 11; linguistic shifts in, 7–8; Mishnaic Hebrew, 7; Modern Hebrew, 7, 9; as a Northwest Semitic language, 7; relation of to Aramaic, 8–9; and vowel points, 9–10; writing of, 9
- Hebrew Bible: A Critical Edition (HBCE)*, 545–46; approximation of the textual “archetype” in, 545; as an eclectic edition, 545; initial title of (*Oxford Hebrew Bible*), 545; rationale for, 545; types of text-critical decisions envisaged in, 545–46; use of the notion of “copy-text,” 546
- Hebrew University Bible*, 541–42; absence of editorial judgment and adequate evaluation of the raw data in, 542; as a diplomatic edition of the Aleppo Codes, 541; nature and aims of, 542; six critical apparatuses of, 541–42
- Herbert of Cherbury, 441–42
- hermeneutics, 406
- Herodotus, 259
- Hesiod, 256, 258, 260
- Hezekiah, 35, 36, 96; and the extension of his life by fifteen years, 303
- Hillel, and the *middot*, 423
- Hinduism, 241
- historical criticism, 91–92, 102n25, 410, 431–51 *passim*, 497, 507; abandonment of the biblical time frame and story line in modern historical criticism, 444; abandonment of “salvation history” in modern historical criticism, 444; aiming of for knowledge and understanding, 431; and the concept of mythology as an explanation of biblical primeval history and apocalyptic imagery, 446; early modern historical-critical scholars, 431–44; historical assumptions gained through historical-critical inquiry, 445–51; limitations of, 507–8; and the philosophy of religion, 445; and the poetic books of the Old Testament, 449–50; and the prophetic tradition in the Old Testament, 448–49
- history: as a portrayal or version of the past, not an accurate “record” or description, 26; presentations of the past in the Old Testament, 27–32, 38, 44–45, 102n9; the problem with “history,” 25–27; as a social construct, 59. *See also* history, presentations of the past in biblical scholarship

- history, presentations of the past in biblical scholarship, 32–44 *passim*, 59–60; and adherence to the biblical time line, 32–33; and the exodus as an historic event, 33–34, 95–96; the lack of archaeological evidence on the united monarchy of David and Solomon, 38–43; minimalists, 59; maximalists, 59; and monumental inscriptions, administrative documents, and other epigraphic artifacts from the empires of ancient West Asia, 35–38, 43–44; and the patriarchs as historical figures, 33; and regional variations and diversities, 34; and rural communities, 33; and women, 33
- history of biblical interpretation, 408; concern with commentaries and theological writings, 408; concern with how a particular text has been understood, 408; subsumption of into the long narrative of reception history, 408–9
- history of interpretation, 411
- Hittite law code, 174
- Hobbes, Thomas, 442–43, 445, 448
- Holiness School, 367
- Homer, 3, 260, 462
- honor and shame: and group unity, 63; and infertility, 71; and marriage, 69–70; and rape, 70–71; and the story of Nabal and Abigail, 72–73
- Hosea, book of, 148, 149; the covenant in, 328; criticism of the false cult in, 146, 146–47; date of, 4; as “prophetic pornography,” 466
- Hoshea, 35
- hospitality, 72–74; of Abraham, 72; in Judges, 74; of Lot, 76n16; as a means of generosity, 72; as a means of protecting property and community from possible violence, 72; as a means of returning to God a portion of what has been given, 72; and obligations, 73; in the patriarchal narratives, 74; and reciprocity, 73; and the story of Nabal and Abigail, 72–73; and the term *xenos* (“foreigner,” “stranger,” “enemy”), 72
- households, and religious space and structures, 356–60; birth rituals, 357; celebration of Passover and Sukkoth, 357, 358; the circumcision ritual, 357, 357–58; death and burial rituals, 357, 359–60; household shrines, 358; the typical Israelite house (the “four-room” or “pillared” house), 356–57
- human condition, the, 293–94; the figurative language used to describe humanity, 300; the flourishing of human life, 300, 308; humans “as his [God’s] image” (*bēšelem*), 273, 273–74, 297–98; Old Testament reflection on the meaning of life and what it is to be human, 295–96; Old Testament terminology for human beings (*’iyš/’iššā, ’ādām, ’ēnōš*), 294–95; and the Old Testament worldview(s), 293–94; sexual intercourse, 301; the transience of human life, 298–300. *See also* afterlife, the; death; humans, connection of with the natural world; marriage; women, and childbirth
- humans, connection of with the natural world, 304–8; farming, 305; herding, 305; the land/earth (*hā ’āreš*), 307–8; the Old Testament’s emphasis on the importance and intrinsic value of the natural world, 306; water sources, 305; the wilderness, 305–6
- Ibn Ezra, 264n3, 538
- Idrimi, inscription of, the “Habiru people” in, 120
- image of God, 273–74, 297–98; and ancient Near Eastern royal ideology, 297–98; the creation of humanity “as his [God’s] image” (*bēšelem*), 273; in the New Testament epistles, 310n13; rarity of the phrase in the Old Testament, 297, 298
- infertility: and divine intervention, 302; and honor and shame, 71; and the rivalry between Peninah and Hannah, 71; and the rivalry between Sarai and Hagar, 71
- Institute for Contemporary Midrash, 426–27
- Instruction of Ahiqar, 183, 184; graded numerical sayings in, 184
- Instruction of Amenemhet, 184
- Instruction of Amenemope, 183, 187
- Instruction to King Merikare, 184
- Instructions of Shuruppak, 184
- Isaiah, book of, 148, 148–49, 207, 212; citation of in the New Testament, 15; the covenant in, 154, 327; date of, 4; exodus typology in Second Isaiah, 415; Isaiah’s “The spoil speeds, the prey hastens” oracle, 142, 143–44, 144–45, 146; and the memorandum (*Denkschrift*) of Isaiah, 148; new divine activities in, 284, 284–85; the scenario of world judgment in, 148; Second Isaiah, 215;

- the so-called Assyrian cycle in, 148; the theme of Zion in, 149; the “vision” or the “words about Judah and Jerusalem” in, 148
- Ishmael: and the covenant with Abraham, 333n17; as doubly abandoned, 72
- Ishtar, local manifestations of, 133, 239
- Islam, 240–41
- Israel: discernible historical origins of, 44; marginal status of, 88; meaning of the word *Israel* in the Old Testament, 86, 101n1, 564; status of as a newcomer in the land of Canaan, 88
- Israel, kingdom of (the northern kingdom), 4, 566 (map); demise of, 4, 31, 44; as a developed “state,” 37–38, 42; the development of Israel and Judah as independent of each other and at different rates, 40–42; and the “shatter zone,” 38. *See also* tribal collectives and the monarchy, and religious space and structures
- Israelites, and monotheism: and ancient Israelite religion, 242–43; archaeological evidence suggesting that polytheism was extremely rare and that Israelites were largely monolatrous in preexilic Israel, 93, 244–46, 253; and figurines of women representing human females or the concept of the feminine, not goddesses, 247–49; Hezekiah, Josiah, and Jehu’s exclusive loyalty to Yhwh, 243; monotheism in the exilic period, 93; and worship of Yhwh and Asherah, 249–52
- Israelites, and polytheism: and ancient Israelite religion, 242–43; and figurines representing fertility goddesses, 246–47, 252–53; Manasseh’s and Ahab’s encouragement of the worship of many deities, 243; portrayal of Israelites as polytheists in the biblical texts, 243–44
- Jacob, portrait of in Genesis, 414
- Jehoiachin, 137
- Jehoiakim, 137
- Jehoshaphat, 47n32
- Jehu, 35, 49n52, 104n57, 141
- Jeremiah, book of, 148, 149; the covenant in, 327; date of, 4; the “foe from the north” in, 150; Jeremiah’s laments in, 150; reports of Jeremiah’s writing in, 142; sayings material in, 150; stories about the prophet Jeremiah in, 136–37
- Jeroboam, 140; the “sin of Jeroboam,” 125, 140
- Jerome, 13, 540; on the Apocrypha, 14
- Jerusalem, 3, 565, 567, 571; capture of by David, 567; as a center of scribal culture, 4; as the dominant theme in Isaiah, 149; in the first millennium BCE, 570 (map); fortified walls of, 41; Hezekiah’s decision to ensure a safe and defensible water supply in, 571; the original city, 567; as a pilgrimage site for the whole nation, 366; the privileging and prioritizing of in the Old Testament, 36; rebuilding of after the exile, 571; as the sacred center of the world, 371; strategic considerations underlying its role as a royal capital city, 571; in the tenth and ninth centuries BCE, 41
- Job, book of, 182, 190–91, 196, 212, 215, 232n19; becoming or returning to dust in, 299; as a complication and a deepening of the wisdom tradition, 194; on creation, 286, 286–87; creative interplay with the psalms in, 233n31; difficult Hebrew in, 204; on God’s being not obligated to counteract instances of what appear to be injustice, 352–53; Job’s friends in, 193, 194; the judicial confrontation between man and God in, 162; as lament, 191–92; on the meaning of life and what it is to be human, 295; as the Old Testament’s *King Lear*, 190–91; as a “poetical book,” 191; as a “polyphonic” book, 194; as the purported work of Moses, 191; quotation or parodying of biblical texts in, 413; stance of toward conventional wisdom, 193–94; use of *’ādām* in, 295; use of *’ēnōš* in, 295; as wisdom literature, 192
- Joel, book of, 151
- Jonah, book of, 112
- Joseph, as a wise man, 198
- Josephus, 152; and the Hebrew canon, 16
- Joshua, book of, 110; date of, 4; Moses typology in, 415; parallels with Assyrian military narratives in, 119–20, 126–27; portrayal of the entry of the Israelites into Canaan in, 92
- Josiah, 137, 567; as the “new David,” 125; as the reformer of cultic life, 125, 140, 447

- Judah, kingdom of (the southern kingdom), 4, 566 (map); demise of, 4, 31, 44; as a developed “state,” 42; the development of Judah and Israel as independent of each other and at different rates, 40–42; and the “shatter zone,” 38. *See also* tribal collectives and the monarchies, and religious space and structures
- Judaism, 240–41; and biblical exegesis, 419. *See also* Judaism, and the Old Testament
- Judaism, and the Old Testament, 18–20, 491–94; and the centrality of the Torah, 19–20; the name “Tanakh” for the Old Testament, 18; the Old Testament as a construct of Judaism and Christianity, 489–90; and Oral Torah, 20; reception of Psalms in, 228–30; threefold division of the Old Testament (the Law or Torah, the Prophets, and the Writings), 18–19
- Jude, book of, quotation from *1 Enoch* in, 17
- Judges, book of: the cycle of polytheistic worship by the Israelites in, 243; date of, 4; portrayal of the entry of the Israelites into Canaan in, 92
- Judith, book of, 113
- Kemosh, 261, 262
- Khirbet el-Qom, 249, 269n24
- Kings, books of, 110–11; condemnation of the “high places” in, 126; cult centralization in, 126; date of, 4; emphasis of on the polytheism of the Israelites, 243; Jerusalem as the only legitimate site of sacrificial worship in, 363; Josiah as a new David in, 127; prophetic narratives in, 120
- kinship, 63–67, 75n10; the *bene hagolah* (“sons of the exile”), 65; the *beth av* (“house of the father”), 64, 64–65, 75n10; breast milk as a kinship-forging substance, 75; the “brother” (*ach*), 65; the clan (*mishpachah*), 64, 65, 75n10; “disintegration” of in certain parts of the biblical material, 65–66; the fluidity of kinship terminology, 64; kinship boundaries as subjective, malleable, and socially constructed, 66; and the Malays of Pulu Langkawi, 75n10; the overlap between kinship and ethnicity, 75n7; and the rise of Jewish nationalism, 65; in Tobit, 65; the tribe (*shebet* or *mateh*), 64. *See also* death; marriage; women, roles of
- Kuntillet ‘Ajrud, 249, 266n24
- Lachish, 36, 135; biblical texts that mention Lachish, 47n28; and the letter from Hoshayahu to Joash (ostrakon), 135–36; ostraca discovered at, 135
- Lamentations, book of, 211, 227
- land/earth, the (*hā ‘āreṣ*), 307; the earth “mourning” or “drying up,” 307; the wrongdoing of human beings as polluting or defiling the land, 307–8
- Latin, 13; *vetus Latina* (“old Latin”), 13
- law, 341–44; and contemporary relevance, 342; different laws as prioritizing different moral principles or instructing different things, 343–44; and the historical circumstances that prompted a particular law and its rationale, 341–42; inclusion of an explanation for the rationale of, 341; instructive format of, 341. *See also* Old Testament, legal texts in
- Leningrad Codex, 3, 9, 19, 534; and the *BHQ*, 542; and the Dead Sea Scrolls, 10; as the earliest known complete manuscript of the Old Testament, 542
- Letter of Aristeas*, 11, 13
- “Letter to the God,” 119–20
- Levites, 224; and the compilation of Psalms, 224; as Temple singers, 224
- Leviticus, book of, 109, 168; date of, 4
- liberation theology, 508, 513–16; advocacy of a “preferential option for the poor,” 514; criticism of, 515–16; focus of on the exodus from Egypt, 514, 515; influence of Marxist social theory on, 513–14; intention of to be a practical, action-oriented approach to the Bible, 514–15; and multinational capitalism, 509
- Lipit-Ishtar law code, 94, 167, 173, 174, 178n16
- Longinus, 472
- Lot, hospitality of, 76n16
- Ludlul bel nemeqi* (“The Poem of the Righteous Sufferer”), 192
- Lutheranism: view of the Apocrypha, 14; view of the two Testaments, 22
- Ma’at, 184
- Maccabees, 4
- Maccabees, books of, 113
- magic: the biblical view of magical practices as indications of sin, 261; and manticism, 138; practice of in the Jewish tradition, 248–49; prohibition of in biblical law, 138, 248, 261

- Maimonides, 421, 439
- Malachi, book of, the covenant in, 328
- Manasseh, 35, 47n27, 314
- maps: 600 BCE clay tablet diagram accompanying an account of the campaigns of Sargon, king of Akkad, 558; and appreciation of the approximate areas occupied by the people of Israel and Judah and their proximity with their immediate neighbors, 565; and awareness of the locations of key cities, 565; and awareness of the locations of major archaeological sites, 561; and awareness of main geographic regions, 564–65; and geographical awareness in the Bible, 557–58; geographic perspectives of ancient sources, 559; lists of towns and boundaries in Joshua, 560; the “Madaba Map,” 558–59; maps as an aid to the study of the Old Testament, 561–71; Old Testament references to geographic features or relative positions, 559; “pictorial” maps from the ancient world, 558–59; the “Table of Nations” (Gen. 10), 560; theological geography in Ezekiel 47–48, 560–61
- Marcion of Sinope, 21
- Marcionism, 21–22
- Marduk, 94, 253, 258; spouse of (Zarpānitum), 94
- Mari (Tell Hariri), royal archive in, 33, 92, 133, 157; letters in, 93, 133, 134; and the rule of David, 92; and the “tribal-nomadic” remote origins of the Israelites, 92–93; words for “king” in the Mari documents (*malikum* and *šarrum*), 92–93
- marriage, 301; in Africa, 70; endogamy, 69; and the expression “to take a wife” (*lāqah ’iššā*), 301; as a form of covenant, 316; and honor and shame, 69–70; as an instrument of personal and political alliance, 69; laws relating to marriage, 301; levirate marriage, 69, 69–70; marriage contracts in the ancient Near East, 301; polygamy, 69, 301, 311n19; range of in the Old Testament, 68–69; and virginity, 69
- Marvell, Andrew, 460
- masorah* (“tradition”), 9
- Masoretes, 9–10, 533, 537, 538
- Masoretic Text (MT), 10, 533, 537–38; as the base text for translations, 548; as a complete Hebrew (and Aramaic) collection of Old Testament texts, 548; *defectivum* spelling in, 10; evidence of its earliest attested forms, 537; as the most commonly used form of the Old Testament, 538; and the proto-M, 537; the Second Rabbinic Bible as the most influential of the early printed editions of, 538
- Megiddo, 37, 38, 39, 40, 567
- Melito of Sardis, 5, 14, 16
- Menahem, 35
- Merneptah, stela of, 46n22, 86; the word *Israel* on, 46n22, 86, 101n3; the word *seed* on, 101n4
- Mesha, stele of, 245, 368; “Omri king of Israel” on, 37
- Mesopotamian literature: historical documents, 91–93; legal documents, 94–95; letters, 93; myths or epics, 90–91. *See also specific Mesopotamian literature*
- Messiah* (George Frederick Handel), 418–19; Handel’s purported triumphalism in, 419
- Meyer, Louis, 443
- Micah, book of, 151
- Michelangelo, statue of the two-horned Moses by, 414
- Middle Assyrian law code, 174, 311n21
- Middle East, 87; the fluidity of the term *Middle East*, 101n6
- Midrash, 20, 420–21, 460; as an ally of deconstructionists and reader-response theorists, 421; association of with *darash*, 420; contrast of with *peshat*, 420; and creative “retellings,” 420–21; the interface between Midrash and reception studies, 421; and multiple interpretations of the same text, 420
- milk: breast milk as a kinship-forging substance, 75n7; characteristics of, 384; and the prohibition of the mixing of with meat, 383–84, 385–86
- Milton, John, 460, 463, 472
- Mishnah, 7, 16, 20, 224, 419
- monolatry, 242; monotheistic monolatry, 242; polytheistic monolatry, 242
- monotheism, 263; common definition of, 240–41; and Israelite aniconism, 269; Moses as responsible for an incipient monotheism, 93; Yhwh’s uniqueness rather than Yhwh’s oneness as the essential content of, 241–42. *See also* Israelites, and monotheism; Old Testament, as a monotheistic work

- Moses: as mediator, 167–68, 319, 320; parallel of his birth account with the birth legend of Sargon, 118–19; as the purported author of Job, 191; as the purported author of the Pentateuch, 121; responsibility of for an incipient monotheism, 93
- Mount Ebal, the bull site on, 374n25
- Mount Sinai, 370–71, 371; association of with Yhwah, 370; location of outside the land of Israel, 370; as Mount Horeb in Deuteronomy, 322; as a “utopian” setting for the idea of Israel’s formation as a theocracy, 321
- Mount Zaphon, 559; association of with Baal, 559; association of with El, 209; Zion as “Mount Zaphon,” 209
- Nachmanides, 268
- Nahum, book of, 150, 151; ethnicity in, 75n5
- Namburbi*, 259
- narrative, 344–46, 497; the “moral of the story” as ambiguous or open to interpretation, 344–45; the moral values in a narrative as belonging to the author, reflecting the norms of the audience, or belonging to the world of the characters, 345; as a way of thinking morally about the complexity of human life, 345–46. *See also* Old Testament, narrative books of
- Nathan, 139, 325
- nationalism, 65
- natural science, 271; and theology, 271–72
- Nebuchadnezzar, 35
- Nebuchadnezzar II, 135
- Neco, 567
- Neo-Assyrian Annals, mention of Israelite kings in, 99, 100
- New Criticism, 455
- New Testament, 5; citation of Isaiah in, 15; citation of the LXX in, 12; derivation of the name *New Testament*, 327; and “Early Christian writings,” 6; historical context of, 25; and “the law and the prophets,” 19, 153, 154; the new covenant in, 330, 331; and the “Prophets” section of the canon, 152; and the term *Second Testament*, 6; use of psalms in, 229. *See also* New Testament, reception of the Old Testament in
- New Testament, reception of the Old Testament in, 417–19; and anti-Judaism, 418–19; and anti-Semitism, 418–19; direct citation of the Old Testament, 417; the eschatological interpretive “horizon,” 416; indirect citation of or allusion to the Old Testament, 417; Jesus as an interpretive “horizon,” 417–18
- Nineveh: royal library in, 133, 135; sack of, 314
- Noah: God’s covenant with, 317–18; as a second Adam, 317
- Numbers, book of, 109–10, 168; date of, 4
- Nuzi, 33; will tablets in, 178n16
- Obadiah, book of, 151
- Old Testament, 3–5; as analogous to a native informant, 56–57; ancient translations of, 10–13 (*see also specific translations of*); in Christianity, 20–22; and contemporary environmentalism, 309; focus of on the human community rather than the individual conception of self, 294; “historical” books of, 4; historical context of, 25; in Judaism, 18–20; as a library of books, 3; as a monotheistic work, 240, 253–63; *Old Testament* as a Christian term, 5, 6; privileged status of as a bounded collection, 485; and “readings from the Hebrew Scriptures,” 6; as a religious book that contains historical documents embedded in narratives and historical nuggets, 98–99; and the term *First Testament*, 6–7; and the term *Hebrew and Aramaic Bible*, 9; and the term *Hebrew Bible*, 5–7, 9, 11, 16–17; and the term *Hebrew Scriptures*, 6; theocentric perspective of, 294. *See also* Old Testament, categories of inner-biblical interpretation in; Old Testament, legal texts in; Old Testament, narrative books of; Old Testament, political and advocacy approaches to; Old Testament, presentations of the past in; Old Testament, prophetic literature in; Old Testament, reception of; Old Testament, theological approaches to
- Old Testament, categories of inner-biblical interpretation in: aggadic exegesis, 415; legal exegesis, 415; mantological exegesis, 415; scribal comments and corrections, 415
- Old Testament, critical editions of. *See Biblia Hebraica Quinta (BHQ); Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia; Hebrew Bible: A Critical Edition (HBCE); Hebrew University Bible*
- Old Testament, languages of. *See* Aramaic; Hebrew

- Old Testament, legal texts in, 160–62, 341–44; and ancient Near Eastern royal edicts, 171–72, 179n22; the collection of laws composed by the prophet Ezekiel, 160; and explanation of their rationale, 341; the juridical dialogue, 161; the juridical parable, 161; and “law in literature,” 160–61; narratives dealing with legal issues, 160; the *rib* pattern, 161, 177n3; stylistic diversity of, 165; texts from biblical narrative, prophecy, and the wisdom literature that mention or allude to the laws of the Pentateuch, 160–62. *See also* Pentateuch, laws of; wisdom literature, didactic instructions in
- Old Testament, narrative books of: apparent chronological sequence of, 109–11; the biblical narratives in their ancient Near Eastern context, 113–20; and the Enneateuch, 111, 112; the formation of the Pentateuchal narrative, 121–24; large narrations as composite units, 111–12; overview of, 109–13. *See also specific narrative books*
- Old Testament, political and advocacy approaches to, 507–9, 527–28; and commitment to the social and political empowerment of the marginalized and oppressed, 508–9. *See also* feminist biblical criticism; liberation theology; postcolonial criticism; queer criticism
- Old Testament, presentations of the past in, 27–32, 38, 44–45; the apparent coherence of the narrative about the past, 27, 32; the distinction between “insiders” and “outsiders” as the overarching trope, 30–32, 102n9; heroes in, 32; the narratives as a written manifesto or memorialization of a particular cultural and social identity, 28–29; the narratives as not providing a reliable or straightforward “record” of the past, 27–28; the period of David and Solomon, 38; the portrait of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, 38; the teaching (*torah*) of Moses as the lens through which the biblical writers view subsequent episodes in the story of Israel, 29; villains in, 32. *See also* history, presentations of the past in biblical scholarship
- Old Testament, prophetic literature in: the *corpus propheticum*, 152; and the *Fortschreibung* process, 148, 153; Isaiah’s “The spoil speeds, the prey hastens” oracle, 142, 143–44, 144–45; the Major Prophets, 142; the Minor Prophets, 142; and the presence of the word of God, 152–53; the prophetic books, 145–54, 198–99, 346–48 (*see also specific prophetic books*); prophetic tales, 136–41; and the reinterpretation of the historical prophet in literary tradition, 145–46; and the theory of the Chronicler, 152; the transition from prophetic oracles to prophetic books, 142–47
- Old Testament, reception of, 405–6, 424–25; and anthropology, 406; and approach, stance, and filter, 421–24; the ethics of reception history, 425–27; and hermeneutics, 406; and inner-biblical exegesis, 413–14; the main questions being asked, 411–12; and oral tradition, 413; and the question “Reception of what?” 412–14, 415; and sociology, 406; study of (drawing on anthropology, sociology, and hermeneutics), 406; terminology and different approaches to biblical reception studies (*see also specific approaches*), 406–12. *See also* Dead Sea Scrolls; Gemara; Midrash; Mishnah; New Testament, reuse and reinterpretation of the Old Testament in; Old Testament, categories of inner-biblical interpretation in; Rewritten Scripture; Talmud
- Old Testament, theological approaches to, 501–2; Childs and Brueggemann as advocates of a new paradigm, 488–89; and evaluative judgments, 482–83; the modern paradigm of Old Testament theology, 480–83; and the Old Testament as a construct of Judaism and Christianity, 489–90; and the received form of the Old Testament text, 494–98; recontextualization, 491–94; religious believers as Old Testament scholars, 481–82; and the responsibility of articulating Christian or Jewish perspectives in relation to the Old Testament, 487; “scriptural reasoning,” 493–94; and the social nature of knowledge, 486; a sociocultural (postliberal) context for a new paradigm, 483–87. *See also* theology, and engaging with theological subject matter
- Omri, 36–38, 40; Jehu’s wiping out of his dynasty, 141; in Kings, 36, 37; and “Omri-land,” 37; and “son of Omri,” 37; on the stele of Mesha, 37

- Origen, 202n1, 330, 473
- Orthodoxy: reliance on the LXX, 548; view of the Apocrypha, 21
- Owen, Wilfred, 423
- pagan gods. *See* divine beings, in the Old Testament
- Palestine, 564, 564 (map); strategic importance of, 567
- Passover, 168; celebration of in a family context, 358; in the pilgrimage festival cycle, 397–99; as a representation of the exodus, 398; ritual process of, 398–99
- Paul: use of Jewish books by, 17; writing of only in Greek, 11
- Pekah, 35
- Pentateuch, 4, 11, 109; contradictions, tensions, and repetitions in, 121–22; the formation of the Pentateuchal narrative, 122–24. *See also* Documentary Hypothesis; Pentateuch, combination of laws and narrative in; Pentateuch, laws of
- Pentateuch, combination of laws and narrative in, 166–71; and the concept of *imitatio dei*, 170; ideological-theological reasons for, 168; and laws with veiled allusions to the historical or narrative tradition, 170–71; the merger of narrative and laws, 168–69; and reference to past and future events, 169–70; as a structural connection (law codes or collections within a narrative frame), 161; stories about the birth of laws, 169; symbiosis between law and narrative, 169
- Pentateuch, laws of, 160, 162–66; apodictic law, 166; blessings and imprecations in, 177–78n8; “The Book of the Covenant,” 94–95, 164, 165, 168, 174, 320, 321; “The Book of Holiness,” 165, 169; casuistic law, 165–66, 174; characteristics of the law collections, 171–73; the Covenant Code, 343; “The Cultic Decalogue,” 164, 165, 168; the Decalogue, 22n1, 167, 177n7, 239, 320, 343; the Deuteronomic Code, 164–65, 166, 343; differences found between parallel laws, 173; the direct address (in second person) to the law’s addressee, 166, 178n11; the divinity of the law, 162–63; the “face-to-face” nature of biblical lawmaking, 166; the hermeneutics of law in the Pentateuch, 321; the Holiness Code, 343, 367; the “if you” form, 166; impracticable, utopian laws, 172–73; the influence of ancient Near Eastern law on the laws of the Pentateuch, 173–75; lacunae in, 172; law codes (“legal literature”), 162, 175–77; “The Little Book of the Covenant,” 164; organization of by association (repeated words or shared concepts), 171; the “participle” form, 166; the priestly legislation, 343; the Ten Commandments (*see* the Decalogue); three normative planes of (the civil-secular, the moral, and the ritual-religious), 163; “unimportant” or even “marginal” laws, 172. *See also* Pentateuch, combination of law and narrative in
- personal names, theophoric, 244–45
- Peshitta, 540; date of, 540
- Pharisees, and the Hebrew canon, 16
- Philo of Alexandria, 224, 434
- pilgrimage festival cycle, 397–99, 399; and agricultural motifs, 397; the atonement cycle of the New Year, 397; as constructive of corporate Israelite identity, 397, 398; the Day of Atonement, 396, 397; and Jerusalem as the political and spiritual center, 398; and memorialization of aspects of Israel’s journey from Egypt to the land of Canaan, 397–98; Passover, 397–99; the role of pilgrimage in, 398; the role of sacrifices in, 397, 398; Shavuot, 397–98; Sukkoth, 397–98
- Plato, 259
- Pliny the Elder, 559
- poetry, 225, 348; and antithetic parallelism, 225; brief poems outside the Psalter, 225–26; and dependence on sense rather than sound, 225; literary imitations of psalms, 226; and metaphorical discourse, 225, 233n30; and parallelism, 310n6; poetry embedded in narrative, 228; and synonymous parallelism, 225. *See also* Dead Sea Scrolls; Lamentations, book of; Song of Songs, book of
- polytheism, 241, 263. *See also* Israelites, and polytheism
- postcolonial criticism, 467, 508, 516–20; basic aim of (to uncover colonial domination and to oppose imperial assumptions and ideologies), 516; on the book of Ruth, 524–26; engagement of in oppositional or resistant readings of the Bible, 516, 518–19; and mass global migration and the creation of multicultural societies, 509; opposition of

- to European hegemonic control over biblical interpretation, 519–20
- postmodernism, 455, 467–70
- prophecy, 346–47; concern with issues that are less obviously ethical, 347–48; as falling somewhere between law and narrative, 346; and obvious ethical issues, 346–47; and social justice, 346. *See also* Old Testament, prophetic literature in; prophets, in the ancient Near East; prophets, in the Old Testament
- prophets, in the ancient Near East, 133–36; the absence of prophetic books by, 142; the god Dagon of Terqa’s “Beneath straw water runs” oracle, 144; and the oracle “Do not fear,” 134; profile of, 133; and prophecy as a vehicle of politics and propaganda, 133–34
- prophets, in the Old Testament, 138–40; and the appointment, accompaniment, and advising of kings, 139–40; communication of messages by, 138–39; date of, 139; the difference between “true” and “false” prophets, 138; the distinction between the historical and the biblical prophets, 141; and the expression “take heed, beware!” 135–36; as heralds of divine judgment and teachers of the law, 138; “lying prophets,” 137; as the opponents of the kings and the monarchy as such, 140; political positions of, 137; profile of, 138; reception of messages by, 138. *See also* Old Testament, prophetic literature in
- Protestantism: and *sola scriptura*, 21; view of the Apocrypha, 13–14. *See also* Anglicanism; Calvinism; Lutheranism
- proto-Israelites, 75n4, 86, 202n3
- Proverbs, book of, 182, 185, 202, 213; and the “act-consequence relationship” (*Tat-Ergehen Zusammenhang*), 188–89, 198, 203n11; admonitions in, 186; aphorisms in, 186; “better than” sayings in, 186; the consummate and upright man in, 192; date of, 4; didactic instructions in, 161–62, 175–76; epistemology of, 190; and the expectation that God will serve as the guarantor of justice, 352; formal features of, 185–86; graded numerical sayings in, 184, 186; “how much more” or “how much less” sayings in, 186; and the Instruction of Amenemope, 187; literary layers in, 186–88; measured cadences of, 193; metaphors for seeking wisdom in, 189; moral reasoning in, 188–90; personification of wisdom in, 189, 285–86; religious motivations in, 183; rhetorical questions in, 186; the simple youth as a central character in, 188
- Psalms, book of: acrostic psalms, 214, 232n17; becoming or returning to dust in, 299; the covenant in, 328–29; date of, 4, 206–7; early Greek (Jewish) and early Latin (Christian) versions of, 229; exilic psalms, 211–12; “For the songs of Asaph” heading in, 221; “For the sons of Korah” heading in, 221; the Great Hallel, 224; influence of Persian religion on, 231–32n14; and interaction with Canaanite culture, 231n4; lack of chronological order in, 215–16; lack of concern for categorization in, 217; lack of interest in the cultic legislation of the Pentateuch in, 218–19; in the LXX, 222–23; on the meaning of life and what it is to be human, 295–96; the oldest concept of creation in, 281–84; outline of according to the forms of the psalms, 216 (figure); overview of the structure of, 222 (figure); “psalms of Korah,” 215–16; reception of in Jewish and Christian tradition, 228–30; re-creation of heart and spirit postulate in, 284; and *selah* (“pause” or “interlude”), 231n13; the so-called Davidic psalms, 206, 230n1; “a song of ascents” heading in, 221; the “Songs of Ascents,” 214, 217, 220, 224, 232n16; and the superscription “to” or “for” the choirmaster (*lamnašše^h*), 206; and the superscription “for” or “dedicated to” David (*ledawid*), 206, 221; use of the name *Elohim* for God in, 221; use of *’ênôš* in, 295; the use of psalmody (as liturgical song), 217–19; use of psalms by the early church fathers, 229; use of psalms by the early rabbis, 229; wisdom in, 198. *See also* Psalms, book of, compilation of; psalms, postexilic; psalms, preexilic
- Psalms, book of, compilation of: the amalgamation of collections to create whole books, 219, 223; the compilation of five books, 219–20, 223–24; compilations from fragments of psalmody into individual compositions, 219, 220–21; the inclusion of individual psalms in collections of psalms, 219–20, 221–23; the Levitical singers as compilers, 224; “orphan psalms,” 223

- psalms, postexilic, 212–15; didactic purpose of, 214; and the expression of Jewish identity with individual acts of piety, 213–14; and the identity of the whole community of faith, 214; influence of other biblical works on, 212; influence of Persian religion on, 212; intensely personal nature of, 212–13
- psalms, preexilic, 207–11; allusions to the Ark in, 207, 207–8, 210; deities other than Yhwh in, 208–9; early prophetic liturgy in, 207; and interactions with the mythologies of the surrounding cultures, 207, 208; nationalistic and military concerns of the preexilic prophets in, 207–8, 209; and “opaque poetry,” 207; references to the king in, 207, 209–10; reflection of an emergent “state religion” in, 207
- Ptahhotep, 184
- Ptolemy II, 11
- Ptolemy Philadelphus, 538
- purity complex, 386–91, 399; as closely associated with that of sacred space and the people who act within sacred places, 388–89; human causes of impurity, 387; and inversion, 389, 390–91; and the issue of contagion, 386, 388–89; purity as defined by life, 387, 389; the ritual of the red heifer, 386, 390–91, 396; the ritual of the scapegoat, 386, 396–97; rituals associated with impurity, 389; and the structural opposition between pure and impure, 386, 386–87; and transformation and movement, 388–89, 390. *See also* death, the impure as defined by death
- Qimhi, 538
- Qohelet. *See* Ecclesiastes, book of
- queer criticism, 466, 508, 520–23; and ambiguity concerning the culturally accepted indicators of sex and gender, 509; appropriation of by a number of disciplines within the humanities, 520; on the book of Ruth, 526–27; contestation of traditional interpretations of biblical passages that appear to condemn same-sex relationships, 521–22; focus of on texts that seem to present same-sex relationships in a positive light, 522–23; promotion of an intellectual climate of tolerance toward gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered people, 523; and the questioning of the notion of “compulsory heterosexuality,” 523
- Qumran, 3, 415–16, 418; and the covenant, 329–30; self-understanding of as a “community of the covenant” (*yahad berit*), 330. *See also* Dead Sea Scrolls
- rape: Dinah’s rape, 70; and honor and shame, 70; Tamar’s rape, 70–71
- Rasbham, 264n3
- Rashi, 538
- reader-response criticism, 407–8, 455, 464; and “aesthetic response,” 407–8
- reception criticism, 409
- reception exegesis, 410
- reception history (*Rezeptionsgeschichte*), 407, 409, 411, 497; and the “aesthetics of reception,” 407–8; concern with everything associated with the texts, 408; concern with media of all types, 408; ethics of, 424–27; and the fusion of “horizons,” 407; and the principle of *Wirkungsgeschichte* (“history of effects” or “history of influence”), 407, 411
- Rehoboam, 99, 104n57
- religious space, 356; as falling along a spectrum of sanctity, 371; as inherently linked to religious time, 371–72. *See also* clans, towns, and tribes, and religious space and structures; creation, the Priestly account of; households, and religious space and structures; Jerusalem, as the sacred center of the world; Mount Sinai; Tabernacle, the; tribal collectives and the monarchies, and religious space and structures
- Rewritten Scripture, 416–17; compositional techniques used in, 417; methods of reworking biblical material used in, 417; and the preservation of earlier readings than the MT, 417
- rituals, biblical: association of with affect and embodiment, 379, 399; as part of a cohesive and meaningful structural system, 378. *See also* food rules complex; pilgrimage festival cycle; purity complex; sacrificial complex
- Rivet, André, 439
- Ruth, book of, 113, 129, 212; date of, 5; and the epithet “Ruth the Moabite,” 63; ethnicity in, 63; feminist biblical criticism reading of, 524; the *hashecenoith* in, 68; as an insertion between Judges and Samuel to correct their

- Deuteronomistic theology, 129; and the legitimation of the integration of foreign women, 129; postcolonial criticism reading of, 524–26; queer criticism reading of, 526–27
- Sabbath, and divine rest, 274
- sacrificial complex, 391–97, 399; animals suitable for sacrifice, 391–92; and the aspect of consumption, 394, 395, 396; the burnt offering, 393, 400n10; and the concept of covenantal meal, 394, 395, 396; and the Day of Atonement, 396; as an extension of the food rules complex, 391, 394; the guilt or trespass offering, 393, 394; and the idealized organization of Israelite geography, 392–93; and inversion, 396–97; and the Levites, 392; the meal offering, 393, 393–94; the Paschal sacrifice, 395; the peace offering, 393, 394, 395; and the resolution of disruption, 394–95; the sin offering, 393, 394, 394–95, 400n10; the somatic and affective impact of, 391, 395, 399; and the structure of Israelite society, 392–93; and the use of blood, 395–96
- Samaria Ostraca, 178n16
- Samerina, 35, 47n25
- Samson and Delilah* (Cecil B. DeMille), 465
- Samuel, 139, 360
- Samuel, books of, 110–11; date of, 4; Josiah as a new David in, 127
- Sargon II, 35, 118; parallels of his birth account with that of Moses, 118–19
- Scene from the Song of Songs* (Gustav Moreau), 410
- Semitic languages, 7; Northwest Semitic languages, 7; predictability of vowel patterns in, 9
- Sennacherib, 36, 96, 314; Annals of, 91; death of, 96; inscription of (Walters Art Museum), 91
- Septuagint (LXX), 11, 12–13, 15, 533, 534, 538–39; arrangement of according to the types of literature, 18; date of, 11; Greek and Russian Orthodox reliance on, 548; Psalms in, 222–23; witness of to a Hebrew parent text that differed from that of the MT, 539
- sexual intercourse, in the Old Testament, verbs used for: *bô* (“to come together”), 301; *šākab* (“to lie with”), 301; *yāda* (“to know”), 301
- Shabako, 9
- Shalmaneser III, 35, 104n57
- Shalmaneser V, 35
- Shamash, 231n8
- Shavuot: in the pilgrimage festival cycle, 397; as a representation of the receiving of the Decalogue, 398
- Shebiktu (= Shapataka), 96–97
- Shema, 239
- Sheol, 67; death’s placement in parallelism with in Psalms, 67
- Sheshonq I (= Shishak), 447; campaign of in Canaan (925 BC), 99–100; and the chronology of the first three kings of Israel, 100; and Egyptian chronology, 104n57
- Shintoism, 241
- Simon, Richard, 445
- Sirach. *See* Ben Sira, book of
- social scientific methods, 54–61; advantages of, 57; applying models cross-culturally, 56, 74n1; and “armchair anthropologists,” 56; as interdisciplinary, 54, 58; and native informants, 56–57; and participant observation, 56, 74n2; presuppositions of, 55; and the problem of anachronism, 55–56; and the problem of the inaccessibility of Israel, 56–57; and the problem of oversimplification, 57; and the problem of reductionism, 57; and the problem of spatial distance, 56; the use of archaeology to reconstruct the social world, 59–60. *See also* ethnicity; hospitality; kinship; marriage; women
- sociology, 406
- Solomon: covenant of with Hiram, 316; portrayal of as a successful royal builder in the Old Testament, 38–39; Solomon and Qohelet, 195; as the unifying conceit for wisdom, 182. *See also* united monarchy of David and Solomon
- “son of man,” 295
- Song of Deborah, 22n1
- Song of Moses, 22n1
- “Song of Release,” 119
- Song of Songs, book of, 182, 227, 473; allegorical interpretation of, 98, 227; celebration of erotic love in, 301
- Spinoza, Baruch, 443–44, 492
- structuralism, 379; focus on the meaning or information communicated by practices, 379

- Sukkoth: celebration of in a family context, 358; in the pilgrimage festival cycle, 397–99; as a representation of the forty-year journey in the wilderness, 398
- Sumerian Laws about Rental Oxen, 179n23
- Šumma izbu*, 259
- Symmachus, 537, 540
- Syriac version. *See* Peshitta
- Tabernacle, the, 369–70; as always located at the center of Yhwh's people, 370; construction of, 370; dimensions, layout, and furniture of as parallel to that of the Temple, 370; and the Holy of Holies, 370, 371; as a miniature cosmos that mirrors the real created cosmos, 189–90; as a possible literary fiction, 370; rituals associated with, 370
- Talmud, 20, 121, 419; *Baba Bathra* 12, 121; the Babylonian Talmud, 419–20; the Jerusalem Talmud, 419; the redefinition of locusts as birds in, 400n6
- Targums, 540; date of, 540
- Tatian, 123
- Tel Dan inscription, 42, 49n52; “House of David” in, 42–43; “king of Israel” in, 42; and the phrase *bytdwd*, 49n53
- Tell el-Amarna, letter archive at, 103n38
- Temple, the, 366–67; foreign architecture of (the long-room temple form), 366–67; the future Temple, 561; and Hezekiah's and Josiah's programs of religious reform, 367; narrative of the construction of, 366; the Second Temple, 150–51; site of (the threshing floor of Araunah), 368; solar worship in, 266n26
- textual criticism: and the identification of accurate readings, 532, 532–40 (*see also key textual sources for the Old Testament* [Dead Sea Scrolls; Masoretic Text (MT); Peshitta; Septuagint (LXX); Targums; Vulgate]); limitations of, 228. *See also* Bible translation; Old Testament, critical editions of
- theocracy, 140, 320, 447, 448
- Theodotion, 537
- theology, 271; and natural science, 271–72. *See also* theology, and engaging with theological subject matter
- theology, and engaging with theological subject matter: the need for a dialectic between exegesis and theology, 499–500; the need for a dialectic between present and past understanding, 498–99; recognition of the deep interconnections between thought and life, 500; recognition of the role of the reader, 498; use of the image of “wrestling” as a way of thinking about theological engagement, 501; use of the terminology of *witness/testimony* and *subject matter* to depict the theological approach to the text, 500–501; use of “theological interpretation of the Old Testament” rather than “Old Testament theology,” 501; uses of the term *theology*, 481
- Thucydides, 446
- Thutmose III, 96
- Tiglath-Pileasar III, 35
- Tirhakah (Egyptian Taharaq), as “king of Cush,” 96–97
- Tobit, book of, 14, 113; ethnic and religious endogamy as a dominant value in, 75n13; kinship in, 65
- Torah, 152; centrality of in the liturgy of Judaism, 19–20; date of, 124; and *halakhah*, 20; as “Instruction,” not “Law,” 124; as the most important part of the Tanakh, 124; Oral Torah, 20; written Torah, 20
- treaties, in the ancient Near East, 313–15, 322, 324; Esarhaddon's Succession Treaties (also Vassal Treaties), 314–15, 332n3; Hittite vassal treaties, 313–14; Neo-Assyrian treaties, 314
- tribal collectives and the monarchies, and religious space and structures, 356; centers of Israelite pilgrimage (*see also* Bethel; Dan), 364–66; the commissioning or decommissioning of religious structures, 368–69; sanctuaries as centers of worship, 367; the temple at Tell Arad, 367–68. *See also* Temple, the
- Tyndale, William, 458–59, 492
- Ugarit, 118; and the epic of Daniel, 118; and the epic of King Kirta (or Keret), 118
- united monarchy of David and Solomon, 3–4: the historical improbability of, 38–43; maximalists' view of, 59; minimalists' view of, 59; portrayal of in the Old Testament, 38; and the portrayal of Solomon as a successful royal builder in the Old Testament, 38–39
- Ur-Namma law code, 167, 173, 174

- Vulgate, 13, 540; date of, 540; and the principle of *veritas hebraica* (the true Hebrew), 540; Roman Catholic reliance on, 548
- Westminster Bible Companion (Westminster John Knox Press), 505
- Wilberforce, William, 297
- wilderness, the (*midbār*), 305–6; ambiguous portrayal of, 305–6; as a place of impurity, 390
- wisdom, in the ancient Near East, 183–84; the Egyptian “House of Life,” 183; the “instruction” genre, 183–84; kings’ courts as theaters of wisdom, 187; and Mesopotamian sages, or *apkallus*, 183; proverb collections, 184; as religious in orientation, 183. *See also specific ancient Near Eastern works of wisdom*
- wisdom literature, 182, 348; characteristics of, 182–83; the common vocabulary of wisdom in, 182; on creation, 285–90; creation as a central category in the study of 189; and the desire to learn from the way the world works in order to live a successful life, 183; didactic instructions in, 161–62; the divine covenant in, 329; and the figure of Solomon, 182; particular literary forms in, 182–83; as a scholarly construction, 182; as a scholarly discovery, 182; in Second Temple Judaism, 202; as a tradition, 199–202; wisdom as a “cultural tradition,” 198; wisdom outside Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes in the Old Testament, 197–99. *See also specific Old Testament books of wisdom*
- Wisdom of Solomon, book of, 14, 182, 201; on creation, 289; date of, 201; as Greek in its whole conception, 16; sacred history as the pattern book of wisdom’s action in the world, 201; wisdom in, 201
- women: and childbirth, 68, 71, 302; and female figurines, 357; and infertility, 71, 302; informal networks of, 68; and rape, 70–71; roles of in Israelite society, 68. *See also marriage*
- Yammu, 281, 282–83
- Yehud, 3, 4, 35, 47n25
- Yhwh: association of with cherubs, 251; association of with Mount Sinai, 370; association of with Mount Zion, 208; as the high god in the Old Testament, 253–63; identification in the patriarchal narratives with El, 118; and the name and the imagery of El, 252; as the personal name of the God of Israel, 239; portrayal of as “Creator of Heaven and Earth,” 284; pronunciation of, 129n1, 264n4; symbolic representation of with the sun, 251; Yhwh and Asherah, 94, 249–52
- Zakkur, inscription of, 134
- Zechariah, book of, 212; the covenant in, 328
- Zedekiah, 135, 137
- Zephaniah, book of, 151; the “Day of Yhwh” in, 150
- Zimri-Lin, 120, 133; parallels of with David, 92