consciously designed to minimize Yannai's achievements and victories, and to diminish his historical greatness); 121-132 D. R. Schwartz, *"Scribes and Pharisees, Hypocrites": Who Were the Scribes?* (The Scribes of the Gospels and Acts are generally to be identified with Levites, not Pharisees. They appear most often as subordinate judicial officials, alongside the high priests, or as teachers and spiritual authorities, alongside the Pharisees. Scribes could claim the right to sit in Moses' seat (Matt. 23:2) not only on the basis of their learning and abilities but also on the basis of their Levitical descent, which they shared with Moses); 133-154 S. Safrai, *The Pious (Hassidim) and the Men of Deeds* (The pietist movement existed from the days of Honni in the 1st cent. B.C.E. until the end of the Amoraic period. The Galilee was the location of this movement. To the list of the pietists, which includes R. Hannin b. Dosa, should be added Jesus of Nazareth, who was close to their world. The various traditions about the pious exalt their poverty, and the virtue of poverty is emphasized in their teaching. In almost all the traditions of their deeds, women are mentioned in a variety of ways, far beyond the usual in Talmudic tradition. The pious are defined as "men of deeds" whose uniqueness lies in emphasizing the good deed and in placing it above the value of Torah learning).

A. S. van der Woude

MORE ON APOCALYPTIC AND APOCALYPSES

BY

E.J.C. TIGCHELAAR

Groningen

In his review article in this journal on the Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, F. García Martínez[1] assessed the more recent methods in the study of apocalyptic. In this evaluation he drew four conclusions, stating which appraoches, in his opinion, have turned out to be less productive than hoped, and which promise to be more stimulating. Recapitulated briefly: both the *religionsgeschichtlich* understanding of apocalypticism of the colloquium, and the generic approach to apocalypses, in the long run fail to clarify Jewish apocalyptic. Conversely, the historical approach which takes the dates of the different apocalypses into account, and traces the internal development of ideas, and the so-called syntagmatic analyses of apocalyptic texts, are to be most heartily welcomed. In brief: we need historical research which allows for temporal specificity, instead of phenomenological descriptions which tend to be too general and ahistorical. On the whole, I immediately agree with this overall view. Nevertheless, I would like to make some comments on a) some of the remarks made by García Martínez, and b) the prevailing attitudes towards the problem of apocalyptic[2].

First of all, I want to consider the generic approach to apocalypses[3]. It is quite understandable that hopes were running

---

[1] F. García Martínez, Encore l'Apocalyptique, *JSJ* 17 (1986), 224-232; a review article on *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East.* Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979, edited by David Hellholm, Tübingen 1983.

[2] I consider the general term 'apocalyptic' preferable to the newly coined 'apocalypticism' which suggests the existence of a distinct ideology. Besides, the former clarity of the term 'apocalypticism' has been obscured by divergent interpretations given to the term.

[3] J.J. Collins (ed.), *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre* (Semeia 14), Missoula 1979; J.J. Collins, The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism, in: Hellholm, *Proceedings*, 531-549; J.J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination. An Intro-*

high, that the approach to apocalypses as a literary genre would lead towards a better defining and understanding of apocalyptic. After all, the apocalypses as texts are material, while the immaterial ideology of apocalyptic could only be deduced from these apocalypses. What is more, a genre would probably display some kind of social setting, or *Sitz im Leben*, which could be related to the ideology. Apocalyptic almost seemed to be reduced to, or, at least, deducible from the genre of apocalypse. To put things straight, COLLINS, in his introduction to the most thorough and best known study of the genre, explicitly rejects these hopes: although ...apocalypse' as a literary genre ... and 'apocalypticism' as a sociological ideology ... are closely related to each other, their referents do not necessarily coincide exactly'', and ''the use of which a genre is put may vary widely''[4]. Even his passage on *The Settings of The Genre*, challenged by GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, merely repeats that settings should not be considered constitutive of a genre, and that one should actually recognize different types of settings. Instead of regretting, as GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ does, the absence of a social setting or a function in the definition that COLLINS gives, one might question the concept of genre which he uses. I will demonstrate that the flaws in his approach, such as the ahistorical understanding of the apocalypses, the arbitrary geographical and temporal scope of his study, the disregarding of the place of apocalyptic chapters like Jubilees 23 or the Testament of Levi 2-5 in the books in which they are transmitted[5], are not necessarily connected with each generic approach.

In modern literary criticism the conviction more and more prevails that genres must be approached as historical entities[6].

---

duction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity, New York 1984 (particularly ch. 1 The Apocalyptic Genre); J.J. COLLINS, Apocalypse. An Overview, *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, New York 1987, I, 334-336; D. HELLHOLM, The Problem of Apocalyptic Genre and the Apocalypse of John, *SBL 1982 Seminar Papers*, 157-198. See also on the genre of apocalypse the contributions to the Uppsala Colloquium by J. CARMIGNAC (163-170), L. HARTMAN (329-344), E.P. SANDERS (447-460) and H. STEGEMANN (495-530, in particular 498f.).

   [4]) *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre*, pp. 3f.
   [5]) F. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, Encore l'Apocalyptique, p. 229.
   [6]) See e.g. T. TODOROV (ed.), *Théorie de la littérature. Textes des Formalistes Russes.* Paris 1965; T. TODOROV, *Introduction à la littérature fantastique*, ch. 1:Les genres littéraires, Paris 1970, 7-27; H.-R. JAUSS, Littérature médiévale et théorie des genres, *Poétique* 1 (1970), 79-101, reprinted in G. GENETTE et al., *Théorie des Genres*, Paris 1986; H.L.J. VANSTIPHOUT, Some Thoughts on Genre in Mesopotamian Literature, in K. HECKER und W. SOMMERFELD (eds.), *Keilschriftliche Literaturen.*

They have their own history and should be seen as part of a greater system of literature. ''Historical'' here implies that genres, and literature as a consequence, evolve. One might say genres are born, live and die. Each new work of art modulates, or varies, or departs from its generic convention, and as a result brings some changes to that genre. In a way, each genre permanently undergoes transformations. That is why a number of scholars no longer conceive of ''genre'' as meaning ''class'', but as meaning ''family'', or ''group of historically connected relatives''. This concept of genre implies that not all the characteristic marks of the genre need be found in every member of the family. Some features present as a rule may be thought of as typical of the family, but there is no single feature which is always present. The inevitable conclusion of such a concept of genre is that ''genres at all levels are positively resistant to definition''[7]. From this it does not follow that talking about genres is meaningless. Though it may be impossible to define genres, it certainly is possible to identify their members. The rejection of genres as classes, and their analysis as historical entities, prevent us from drawing clear-cut boundaries between the different genres. But that is simply an implication of the fact that genres are positively resistant to definition. The existence of mixed genres was a problem as long as one approached literature normatively, whereas the taxonomic approach tried to cope with them by distinguishing ever more classes. A historical analysis which allows for continuous changes should have to difficulties with works which do not fit into just one group. With regard to the evolution of genres it may well be possible to discern several stages. The first stage might be compared with the birth and childhood of the genre. How are genres born? Features belonging to other genres are assembled into a new work of art. It is worth mentioning that this is not a mere theoretical assumption. In reality, this procedure is often clearly perceivable, although the ''pillaged'' genres need not always belong to *les lettres*, and sometimes have to ascribed to *la foule*.[8] After

---

Ausgewählte Vorträge der XXXII. Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale Münster, 8.- 12.7.1985, Berlin 1986, 1-11. Good introductions to generic theory are H. DUBROW, *Genre*. London 1982, and especially A. FOWLER, *Kinds of Literature. An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*, Oxford 1982.

   [7]) A. FOWLER, *Kinds of Literature*, p. 40
   [8]) Examples of this procedure in modern and medieval literature are given in B. TOMACHEVSKI, Thématique, in: TODOROV, *Théorie*, 304f and JAUSS, 95ff. Note that oral traditions need not always originate in *la foule*, but may be intellectual

such a birth, gradually a formal type is generated. In the second stage this form is used as a model. Authors deliberately follow the examples which were tried out in the first stage. Some of these examples may come to be considered canonical in the literary sense. There is an urge to imitate or surpass them. At last, in time, the continuously reproduced genre loses its effectiveness, and is ousted by new genres, or thrust aside to the periphery, unless it is renewed by a structural modification[9]. Of course these phases may run concurrently. Such a sketch not only raises diachronic question (how did the genre arise? and, did it develop into a new genre?) but also synchronic ones, such as, which other genres did it have to compete with? or, which of the other genres was compatible with the genre concerned, and which not? Evolution of the genre also implies that designations and identifications of a generic type are always retroactive. One should not be deluded into thinking that the identification, and therefore meaning, of a text of a generic type during the first phase will be identical with that of a text of the same generic type in a later phase just because the same genre is involved. One should not confuse a genre with its name.

From necessity the outline of this alternative concept of genre is condensed. Here we are concerned with the application of this particular view of genre to the genre "apocalypse". In advance, we have to take notice of a potential fundamental objection: is it possible to treat apocalypses as literary texts, that is, as obeying the rules of literature? After all, the main motives of writing apocalypses are religious, not literary. The question to what extent the texts we are dealing with are literary in a narrow sense lies beyond the scope of my argument. Anyway, we should be careful in imposing our contemporary aesthetic standards upon ancient literature. What is

---

too. A nice example from Near Eastern Literature is the Mesopotamian Story of the Fox which has assembled generic features belonging to the fable, the dispute, the epic narrative and the genre of the legal case. I wish to thank H.L.J. VANSTIPHOUT for discussing with me the theory of genres and for showing me his article on the Story of the Fox, Een (k)oud spoor in de vossejacht?, forthcoming in the *Belgisch Tijdschrift voor Filologie en Geschiedenis*, 1988 fasc. 1.

[9]) JAUSS, p. 95, terms these stages: canonisation, creation of automatisms, and change of functions. The first term, however, is misleading: the actual process of canonisation (regarding as canonic) really occurs in the second stage. COLLINS, in *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, p. 3, does mention these three phases (referring to an earlier article of FOWLER), yet he hardly applies this insight.

---

more, it is quite difficult to single out generic rules which govern "literary" genres only.

Seeing genre as a historical group with family resemblances restricts the generic analysis to texts which are genetically related. The so-called Greek and Roman apocalypses should not be treated together with the Jewish apocalypses, unless, of course, one has persuasive arguments in favour of historical interrelationships. Such a generic analysis also asks for a historical approach, taking different stages of development into account. The Book of the Watchers (Eth. Enoch 1-36) is rather different from f.i., 4 Ezra. This is not merely a difference between apocalypses with an otherworldly journey, and historical apocalypses. It is primarily a difference due to the development of the genre. The genre forms which were already fixed for the most part in the second half of the 1st century C.E., had yet to be assembled when the Book of the Watchers was composed. COLLINS[10] draws attention to the fact that the increasing use of the genre designation "apocalypse" might be considered as an indication of the growing awareness of the genre features. But not only is the designation of already existent works as apocalypses a retroactive deed, regarding these works as apocalypses also presupposes the fixed genre forms which only gradually developed. Most of the older apocalypses lack some features which later on became customary. Daniel 7-12, Jubilees 23, Test Levi 2-5 are not independent compositions, but belong to a greater literary complex; Enoch's Dream Visions are without the usual interpretation of the visions; the Astronomical Book of Enoch has a quite unique subject matter. Once again the study of genre actually is the study of the evolution of the genre. One should ask which works influenced the genre more than others[11]. Ever since 1 Enoch 1-36 has been dated prior to the Book of Daniel, scholarship has tended to regard it as more important than Daniel for the study of the genre. It is a good thing that biblical canonicity is no longer considered normative. But what about generic canonicity? Because of their

---

[10]) *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, p. 3.

[11]) A genre can be influenced by other genres during all stages of its history. One example of a feature adopted by the genre of apocalypse from another genre is investigated by K. KOCH, Vom prophetischen zum apokalyptischen Visionsbericht, in: HELLHOLM, *Proceedings* 413-446. Quite a lot of features belonging to the apocalyptic genre seem to be derived from the prophetic literature. Yet in order to tackle the moot question of the descent of apocalyptic, one should take the ensemble of features into account.

biblical canonicity, books like Daniel and the Apocalypse of St. John are more likely to have influenced the development of he genre in later times than other apocalypses.

To do justice to COLLINS, it must be said that, in spite of his classificatory treatment of the genre, he certainly has an eye for the historical perspectives[12]. Yet his concept of genre is basically ahistorical, and the historical perspectives stay in the background. One must admit that his definition of the genre singles out most of the conspicuous apocalypses. It should not, however, be used as a definition because it principally disregards the existence of marginal cases. The consequence of this is the somewhat arbitrary drawing of boundary lines between apocalypses and related texts. Instead one might use the definition as a heuristic guideline. At least it enables us to see more clearly the variations between the apocalypses themselves, as well as differences between obvious apocalypses and more marginal ones.

COLLINS's definition, which I prefer to use as a guideline, consists of features of both form and content. The study of the history of the genre should indeed take both features into account. The function, or meaning, of the genre depends on the particular use of the genre in a specific historical time and place[13]. In my opinion, the study of the genre as propagated, converges with the historical approach which GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ recommends. In the same way as the genre is subject to evolution, its content, the ideas, develop in the historical process. A major future task in the study of apocalyptic might well consist in the describing of the development of ideas encountered in the apocalypses. Recently some valuable initiatives have been taken towards the outlining of such a history of ideas, notably by SACCHI[14]. In a series of articles he meticulously studied the elaboration of concepts in the successive layers of the Book of the Watchers, to continue with the depiction of the unfolding of these ideas in the later apocalypses. As a result one gains a clear in-

---

[12]) See e.g., *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre*, pp. 15-18.

[13]) Contra D. HELLHOLM, The Problem of Apocalyptic Genre. Compare J.J. COLLINS, The Apocalyptic Technique: Setting and Function in the Book of the Watchers, *CBQ* 44 (1982) 91-111.

[14]) See F. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, Encore l'Apocalyptique, 230f and 231, note 12. Add P. SACCHI, L'apocalittica del I sec.: Peccato e giudizio, in B. CHIESA (ed.), *Correnti culturali e movimenti religiosi del giudaismo. Atti del V Congresso internazionale dell'AISG S.Miniato, 12-15 novembre 1984* (AISG Testi e studi 5), Rome 1987, 59-77.

into the apocalyptic speculation on the origin of evil. Yet his assumption is open to objections. He takes the view that in order to discover what apocalyptic really is one has to return to the first apocalypse. Before one knows it, apocalyptic is equated with themes of the first apocalypse. Thus SACCHI[15] declares that the characteristic idea of apocalyptic is the idea that nature is contaminated by a primeval angelic sin, and that consequently judgment and salvation have to be brought about by supernatural means too. As a result of this view the Book of Daniel is removed to the periphery of apocalyptic because is does not attribute the degeneration of history to the original angelic sin. Basically, the tendency to reduce apocalyptic to one single idea is questionable. On top of that, the procedure of limiting a phenomenon to its supposed original appearance is historically improper, because it disregards the possibility that later features may become characteristic too. In this connection it is appropriate to spend some remarks on the consequences of the redating of the Book of the Watchers. On account of the Qumranic Enoch fragments, we can take it for granted that the Book of the Watchers at the beginning of the 2nd century B.C.E. had almost reached the shape we encounter in the Ethiopic and Greek texts. Because of the several layers of the work, it is safe to argue that substantial parts (ch. 6-11; 6-16; 6-19?) are considerably older. Instead of a reserved dating in the 3rd century, some scholars venture a 4th or 5th century B.C.E. origin. In that case one should also reconsider the position of the so-called proto-apocalyptic parts of the Old Testament. Instead of standing at the threshold of apocalyptic, they might just as well be contemporaneous with (or even later than) these Enochic parts[16]. If so, we should question the traditional linear development of proto-apocalyptic towards apocalyptic. Altogether, a simple pronouncement that the Book of the Watchers is the oldest apocalypse and hence contains the essence of apocalyptic seems a little bit too easy.

---

[15]) L'apocalittica del 1 sec., 61 et passim.

[16]) I do not think the early dating of Trito-Isaiah of Deutero-Zechariah by P. HANSON in his influential *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*, Philadelphia 1975, is at all convincing. His argument depends to a large extent on the textual reconstruction of the original poetic metre. All too often these reconstructions are not to be justified by his general rules of poetic change. Especially when departing from the transmitted text, one should give good reasons for each change. If one takes the liberty of altering texts, it is possible to argue for almost any view.

The inevitable key question remains yet to be discussed: what is apocalyptic? or, stated semantically instead of ontologically: what does the word apocalyptic signify? A great amount of scholarly effort has been put into this problem. Nevertheless, nowadays, a general agreement seems more remote than ever before. Of course, one must admit that recent research has been most illuminating in showing the complexity of the concept. Apocalyptic is a compound consisting of eschatological as well as cosmological and mystical elements. Opinions differ however about the importance of such features. Each definition raises opposition. In fact, in my view, apocalyptic, too, is resistant to definition. For this reason some scholars have argued for abandoning the term 'apocalyptic' altogether[17]. Yet such a radical procedure is not necessarily the most sensible solution. Instead, the outcome of the Uppsala colloquium, "contra definitionem, pro descriptione", is the most appropriate way, not only for the time being, but basically, of investigating apocalyptic. A definition is not a prerequisite for historical studies, and might even prove to be an impedient. Description, on the other hand, need not be identical with an isolated treatment of texts or features (which of course have many things in common), but clears the way for a better understanding of the historical complexity and variety one encounters in the texts freely labelled apocalyptic.

---

[17]) M.E. STONE, List of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature, in: F.M. CROSS et al. (eds.), *Magnalia Dei. The Mighty Acts of God*, New York 1976, p. 443; T. Francis GLASSON, What is Apocalyptic?, *NTS* 27 (1981), p. 101. STONE reconsidered his proposal in his Apocalyptic Literature, in: M.E. STONE (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, Assen/Philadelphia 1984, p. 394.

ANTI-EGYPTIAN POLEMIC IN THE LETTER OF ARISTEAS 130-165 (THE HIGH PRIEST'S DISCOURSE)

BY

M. A. L. BEAVIS

Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

Introduction

Perhaps the most mystifying, and certainly the most amusing, line in the *Letter of Aristeas* occurs in the midst of the high priest Eleazar's discourse (130-165): "Do not accept the exploded idea that it was out of regard for 'mice' and the 'weasel' and other such creatures that Moses ordained these laws with such scrupulous care; not so, these laws have all been solemnly drawn up for the sake of justice, to promote holy contemplation and the perfecting of character" (144)[1]). The usual explanation of the function of the discourse in *Aristeas*, including this peculiar reference to Jewish abstinence from rodents, is that the author was concerned either to elucidate Jewish customs for Gentiles[2]), or to make seemingly outdated and irrelevant practices more palatable to hellenized Jews[3]). However, neither explanation fully takes into account the structure and logic of the discourse, the specific interests which the discourse shares with the rest of the "letter", and the unusual wording of the puzzling reference to "mice" and "the weasel". This paper will use these three aspects of the discourse to provide a fuller explanation of the issues which necessitated its composition.

1. Structure and Logic

The question of the Greek emissaries which introduces the discourse is about "food and drink and animals regarded as

---

[1]) The text of *Aristeas* used in this paper is M. HADAS, *Aristeas to Philocrates* (New York: Ktav, 1973).

[2]) E.g., H.T ANDREWS, "The Letter of Aristeas", *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha* 2 (ed. R.H. CHARLES; Oxford: Clarendon, 1913) 84-85.

[3]) E.g., V. TCHERIKOVER, "The Ideology of the Letter of Aristeas", *HTR* 51 (1958), 62.