

QUMRAN PESHER: TOWARDS THE REDEFINITION OF A GENRE*

I. Aim

THE aim of this article is to raise yet again the question of the generic definition of peshet as used by scholars in their discussions of the biblical commentaries and other texts. Increasingly and variously we are being told that certain material not from Qumran bears the qualities or characteristics of peshet and it is assumed that these characteristics are known. A striking example of the comparative use of the genre label peshet is in the 1968 article of D. GOLDSMITH, *Acts 13 33-37: A Peshet on II Samuel 7*. (1) GOLDSMITH attempts to elucidate these five verses of *Acts 13* through their comparison with the use of *II Samuel 7* in *4 Q Flor*, but nowhere does he give the reader a definition of peshet and furthermore a close look at the section of *4 Q Flor* of his concern shows that nowhere does the word peshet occur in any formulation. Clearly GOLDSMITH'S approach is somewhat loose.

The term peshet is also being used more vaguely than by GOLDSMITH by many scholars involved in the study of comparative midrash. For example, D. HAY writes: "A special group of eleven fulfillment quotations appears in Matthew..., and a similar set of thirteen in John. These sets of citations are introduced by distinctive formulas and characterized by an interpretive approach having important affinities with the midrash *peshet* attested in certain Qumran texts". (2) Similarly J. D. G. DUNN describes peshet as "a narrower form of midrash," yet is so vague

(*) I am grateful to the Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies for enabling me to do much of the preliminary work on this paper.

(1) *Journal of Biblical Literature* 87 (1968), pp. 321-324. This same misnomer has been used most recently by H. BURGMANN, *Gerichtsherr und Generalkläger: Jonathan und Simon*, in *Revue de Qumran* 9 (1977-1978), p. 61.

(2) *NT Interpretation of the OT*, in *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Supplementary Volume* (Nashville, 1976), pp. 443-444.

in his distinction between the two that it is difficult to see precisely the usefulness of his introducing *peshar* into the discussion of the treatment of various Old Testament texts in the New Testament. (3) Or again, J. SCHMITT writes: "Le fragment d'*Act.*, IV, 25-26 et 27-28 répond à l'exégèse fondamentalement commune au *peshar* et au *midrash*" (4) and although he then cites examples of their similarity in structure, content and method, the comparison remains generically vague. Lastly, and also picked at random, M. WADSWORTH in his review article "A New PSEUDO-PHILO" (5) notes that C. PERROT concludes that PSEUDO-PHILO's *Biblical Antiquities* is "neither a targum, nor a *peshar* commentary, nor does it resemble later exegetical *midrashim*". (6)

Although it may be true, as G. VERMES points out, (7) that there are two significances for the modern use of the word *peshar*, that is, that it can designate a literary work of biblical interpretation, or that it can be used of a certain type of nonliteral interpretation, it must also be that the latter in some way depends on the former. Any vagueness of the term's use in describing nonliteral interpretation should not be allowed to make the understanding of the genre *peshar* among the Qumran texts become similarly vague.

From all the examples above, which no doubt the reader could multiply, it seems as if writers can assume that the definition of *peshar* is known by modern scholars and that such definition is helpful in studies involving comparative *midrash*. Yet the history of scholarship reveals that such an assumption is indeed unwarranted. Qumran scholars have disagreed openly in their definitions of *peshar* and still do differ. It seems desirable, therefore, to investigate once more the nature of *peshar* in the light of a generation of Qumran study before the term becomes the valueless chattel of the non-specialist.

(3) *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament* (London, 1977), pp. 84-85, 88-89; adequately and justifiably criticised by L. W. HURTADO in his review in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* 98 (1979), p. 136.

(4) *L'exégèse apostolique*, in *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible*, édité par H. CAZELLES & A. FEUILLET (Paris, 1978), Fascicule 51, col. 1013.

(5) *Journal of Jewish Studies* 29 (1978), pp. 186-191; reviewing C. PERROT & P.-M. BOGAERT, *Pseudo-Philon, Les Antiquités Bibliques*, tome II, *Introduction littéraire commentaire et index* (Paris, 1976).

(6) *A New Pseudo-Philo*, p. 186.

(7) *Interpretation, History of... At Qumran and in the Targums*, in *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Supplementary Volume* (Nashville, 1976), pp. 438-439.

II. Peshar in the History of Scholarship (8)

To put the whole matter in perspective and to see the current disagreement about the nature of peshar it is worth considering the history of scholarship on the subject. To avoid being too longwinded we may start with the work of J. CARMIGNAC. In his valuable discussion of the literary genre of the Qumran commentaries of 1963 (9) he defines peshar in terms of the author's intention of revealing the hidden sense and the mysteries of prophetic texts at the expense of the literal sense of the text. A variety of seemingly artificial procedures are used to this end (10) and all the pesharim share the same style, formulas and sobriquets. CARMIGNAC even ventures so far as to claim that they all have the same author. All these characteristics are to be seen not in the tradition of midrash or commentary but in that of dream-interpretation as evidenced in *Daniel*.

Yet even CARMIGNAC himself admits that such a definition according to content, method, authorship and tradition is far from decisive. In 1971 he acknowledged that there is no scholarly agreement as to what a peshar is, though he attempted to summarize the general feeling among scholars: "On peut, semble-t-il, le décrire comme un genre littéraire qui recourt à des textes bibliques, considérés comme des annonces ou des prophéties de réalités futures, et qui les interprète en fonction de ces réalités, en montrant comment les divers détails des textes bibliques s'appliquent à tel personnage, à tel événement ou à telle circonstance". (11) He then proposed that there are two subcategories of peshar: "continu," in which there is systematic interpretation of a portion of the Bible, and "thématique," in which texts are chosen deliberately from the whole Bible and grouped artificially around a theme. Apart from those characteristics which could equally well apply to a definition of midrash, (12) the distinctive and therefore definitive characteristic of peshar for CARMIGNAC remains that it treats prophetic material. Although this may hold for

(8) Some of this section is dependent on earlier work available in my dissertation, *4Q Florilegium in the Context of Early Jewish Exegetical Method*, Claremont Graduate School, 1978, pp. 223-236 (published by University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan).

(9) *Les Textes de Qumrân traduits et annotés* (Paris, 1963), vol. II, pp. 46-47.

(10) See J. CARMIGNAC, *Le genre littéraire du "Pêshèr" dans la Pistis-Sophia*, in *Revue de Qumrân* 4 (1963-1964), p. 522, for further remarks on the method of peshar.

(11) *Le Document de Qumrân sur Melkisédeq*, in *Revue de Qumrân* 7 (1969-1971), p. 360. He also lists the main studies on peshar as a literary genre.

(12) To which genre CARMIGNAC insists peshar cannot be ascribed: *Les Textes de Qumrân*, vol. II, p. 46; *Le Document de Qumrân sur Melkisédeq*, p. 360.

most texts, it does not cover all by any means: there are some prophetic texts that do not receive interpretation including the necessary PŠR formula (13) and some texts which use the technical formula but do not treat prophetic texts alone. (14)

CARMIGNAC's generic definition of pesher allows us to consider others in which the primary concern in discussing pesher has been content. Among them J. VAN DER PLOEG has claimed that there are many varieties of pesher. Starting his discussion with mention of the commentaries and the definition of pesher as "une interprétation qui dévoile un sens inconnu aux profanes que ceux-ci ne sauraient découvrir", (15) he attempts to show that recognition of the Teacher of Righteousness' knowledge of the divine plan of salvation is the key to understanding his ability to interpret the scriptures, and not that he knew some secret interpretation of the Old Testament. Because of this VAN DER PLOEG is able to say that much of the material in *Dam. Doc.* could be called pesher, even though the actual word occurs there only once (*Dam. Doc.* IV, 14). However, in this view it is difficult to see beyond the vagueness that there is edifying biblical interpretation at Qumran, to any understanding as to why at some points the author chose to describe his interpretation with a formula including the technical word PŠR while in other texts other authors chose not so to do. (16)

C. ROTH has also been concerned to define pesher in terms of content. He concludes that the pesharim are not part of a complete set of commentaries on the whole Bible, but rather that pesher is the inspired application of the terms of the biblical prophecies to the end of days and that "we are to assume therefore that a *pēšer* existed or at any rate was communicated verbally, on all or most of the passages of the Bible—about fifteen in all—in which

(13) E.g., *4 Q Flor.* I, 1-13; *Dam. Doc.* VII, 15-20; *1 Q S V*, 15-17; VIII, 14-16; *1 Q M XI*, 11-12.

(14) E.g., *4 Q 180 frag.* 1, col. I, 1; I, 7. W. H. BROWNLEE, *The Background of Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*, in *Qumrān, sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (ed. M. DELCOR; Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium XLVI, Paris/Leuven, 1978), p. 185, makes a similar and incisive point: "*pēšer*... despite Isaac RABINOWITZ, does not usually mean "presage" at Qumran. In the *pēšarim* "prophetic meaning" is an apt translation; but this becomes "meaning" alone in *4 Q Ordinances*; and in *4 Q Ages of Creation* it is used in headings which may be interpreted as: "A discourse concerning the ages," "a discourse concerning Azazel and the angels"."

(15) *Bijbelverklaring te Qumran* (Amsterdam, 1960), p. 23 (Sommaire en français).

(16) We must allow for reinterpretation in the pesharim and elsewhere by later authors, even though *1 Q p Hab VII*, 3-5 ascribes the task of interpretation to the Teacher of Righteousness alone; see BROWNLEE, *The Background of Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*, p. 188.

the End of Days was specifically mentioned". (17) Yet to assert such a close dependence of peshet on its content being concerned with the latter days is to avoid the question why the author felt that he had to write about the latter days with a peshet, unless it can be demonstrated that wherever there is discussion of the latter days that discussion always takes the form of peshet. (18) Indeed, that this was not the case can be seen in *4 Q Flor* at I, 2 and 12 and at *Dam. Doc.* VI, 11 and *1 Q Sa* I, 1 where there is talk of "End of Days" but no mention of peshet.

Apart from those who have attempted to define peshet according to its content, there are others who have variously considered the genre of peshet. Several have noted that any definition of peshet must take into account the primacy of its structure. Preeminently L. H. SILBERMAN has noted that the structure of the rabbinic *Pelirah* is the same as that of *1 Q p Hab*: "It is immediately apparent that in structure this midrash (19) is parallel to *Hab. Peshet*, with the Aramaic root PTR standing in place of the Hebrew PŠR. The term introduces the specific point of reference from which the entire verse is to be understood. This specification seems to be entirely arbitrary, or rather it is not necessarily connected with any word in the text". (20) SILBERMAN continued by noting that the actual word PŠR is not structurally necessary since personal or demonstrative pronouns can serve the same purpose. This means that for SILBERMAN, as he admitted, there can be nothing that structurally distinguishes peshet from midrash. The former is only distinguishable because of its "contemporizing content". (21) But obviously the New Testament and other contemporary literature is so full of such content within midrashic structures that any precision in SILBERMAN's definition of the genre peshet is lost.

Yet SILBERMAN's work is invaluable for pointing to the primacy of structure in considering peshet. Form rather than content seems to offer the best clue towards the determination of the genre.

(17) *The Subject Matter of Qumran Exegesis*, in *Vetus Testamentum* 10 (1960), p. 53.

(18) L. H. SILBERMAN (*Unriddling the Riddle. A Study in the Structure and Language of the Habakkuk Peshet*, in *Revue de Qumrân* 3 [1961-1962], p. 328, n. 10), in making a similar criticism of W. R. LANE's conclusion (*A New Commentary Structure in 4 Q Florilegium*, in *Journal of Biblical Literature* 78 [1959], p. 346), writes: "Peshet refers to structure and not content. While LANE is correct in defining *4 Q Flor* as a midrash, his suggestion that it be distinguished from Rabbinic midrash because of its messianic, eschatological orientation is irrelevant for the same intent is to be found in some if not all Rabbinic midrash."

(19) In *Qohelet Rabbah* 12, 1.

(20) *Unriddling the Riddle*, p. 328.

(21) *Unriddling the Riddle*, p. 329.

Most precisely in his recent study I. RABINOWITZ has concluded: "the term *peshet*, in fine, never denotes just an explanation or exposition, but always a presaged reality, either envisaged as emergent or else observed as already actualized". (22) Most significantly, for RABINOWITZ *peshet* is necessarily formally articulated in Qumran in two ways, the choice of which is secondarily determined by the content of the *peshet*, i.e., whether it is on the one hand a person, group or epoch, or on the other hand a statement of the actuality held to be the presage of the cited scriptural words. In citing examples from the scrolls, he is concerned first of all to identify which form the *peshet* has and then, secondly, to see how the content relates as presage to the text receiving the *peshet*. (23) Thus the Qumran *pesharim* are so many presagings of certain portions of scripture which must have a certain form with a particular formula, and because the correct understanding of the content of the *peshet*, i.e., its statement in ordinary language concerning the realities of the present or of the immediate future as prefigured in the Bible, necessarily depends on one or other particular form while the content is variable except as to its concern with immediacy, (24) it must be concluded that for RABINOWITZ *peshet* is primarily a formal generic description.

While RABINOWITZ can be said to have observed the formal character of *peshet*, he does not accede to SILBERMAN's view that the structure of the *pesharim* clearly puts them in line with the later *midrashim*. In fact RABINOWITZ states categorically: "neither in method nor in form is a *Peshet* any kind of *midrash*, as familiar to us from Rabbinic literature". (25) Though such a statement would seem incontrovertibly inappropriate in light of the technical use of the term *MDRŠ* in *4Q Flor* I, 14, it is clear that when one assesses RABINOWITZ's work alongside that of SILBERMAN, it appears as if there has been little progress since VERMES claimed in 1955 that as far as *peshet* and its relation to *midrash* was concerned, there was an unavoidable impasse. (26)

Indeed the problem of the relationship between *peshet* and *midrash* has long been debated and the history of the debate

(22) *Pēsher/Pittārōn. Its Biblical Meaning and its Significance in the Qumran Literature*, in *Revue de Qumrān* 8 (1972-1974), pp. 225-226.

(23) It may indeed be that RABINOWITZ is too rigid in his analysis of the various forms and that he allows too little room for semantic development of the word *pēš* and its cognates in his study; on this see W. H. BROWNLEE, *The Midrash Peshet of Habakkuk* (Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series; Missoula, 1979), Introduction, ad locum.

(24) AS also for SILBERMAN, *Unriddling the Riddle*, p. 329.

(25) *Pēsher/Pittārōn*, p. 231.

(26) *A propos des Commentaires bibliques découverts à Qumrān*, in *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 35 (1955), p. 102.

discussed elsewhere. (27) Suffice it to say that three positions have been taken among scholars: that the pesharim are not midrash, (28) that they are some form of midrash (29) or that they are midrash peshet. (30) It is clear that such variety of opinion will continue until there is some greater clarity of generic definition for the pesharim.

The problems of whether form or content is to be used as the basis of generic definition, and of how the pesharim relate to the traditions of the midrashim can be seen even in the latest statements on the whole issue. Writing against associating the pesharim with midrash, M. DELCOR concludes concerning *IQp Hab* that "les auteurs ont désigné à tort notre écrit sous le nom de *Midrash d'Habacuc*". (31) On the other hand very much in favour of aligning the pesharim with midrash in some way is the work of W. H. BROWNLEE. (32)

That the question of form or content as determinative of peshet is still open can be seen most recently from the work of G. VERMES alone. In 1976, writing of biblical interpretation at Qumran and in the targums, he included peshet as one of the "forms of Qumran exegesis". (33) Yet in 1977 he defined peshet on the basis of content as "fulfilment interpretation of prophecy". (34)

(27) Notably, A. G. WRIGHT, *The Literary Genre Midrash* (New York, 1967), pp. 80-82; E. SLOMOVIC, *Toward an Understanding of the Exegesis of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, in *Revue de Qumrân* 7 (1969-1971), pp. 3-5.

(28) E.g., J. CARMIGNAC, *Les Textes de Qumrân*, vol. II, p. 46; I. RABINOWITZ, *Pēsher/Pittārōn*, p. 231.

(29) E.g., L. H. SILBERMAN, *Unriddling the Riddle*, pp. 328-29; R. LE DÉAUT, *Apropos a Definition of Midrash*, in *Interpretation* 25 (1971), p. 282, n. 85.

(30) E.g., most consistently, W. H. BROWNLEE, *The Dead Sea Habakkuk Midrash and the Targum of Jonathan* (Mimeographed paper, 1953), p. 12; *The Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls for the Bible* (New York, 1964), pp. 63-65; and in its very title, *The Midrash Peshet of Habakkuk*. In this he has been supported by K. STENDAHL and P. GRELOT (see A. G. WRIGHT, *The Literary Genre Midrash*, pp. 83-84) and also be E. SLOMOVIC, *Toward an Understanding of the Exegesis of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 4-5.

(31) *Les Pesharim ou les Commentaires qumrâniens*, in *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible*, Fascicule 51, col. 905.

(32) See the works cited in Note 30.

(33) *Interpretation*, History of, p. 438, italics mine; see: "From the point of view of structure, the pesharim belong to one or other of two categories: the interpreter either deals with each biblical unit separately or seeks to establish a connection between the successive series" (p. 439).

(34) *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective* (London, 1977), p. 71. This is a summary of his slightly longer description of 1975: "In this domain, the Qumran peshet, or fulfilment interpretation of real or presumed prophecy, occupies pride of place... The Qumran exegetes saw in the words of the prophets predictions referring ultimately to events marking the destiny of their own movement" (*The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on Jewish Studies during the last Twenty-Five Years*, in *Journal of Jewish Studies* 26 [1975], p. 11).

Although it may be over-zealous to separate form from content in this way, this latter definition clearly conflicts somewhat with the earlier primary categorisation according to form.

Out of all this variety and disagreement there does appear, however, to be some small consistency, for it seems that whatever the generic definition of *peshet*, there is general agreement that the *pesharim* stand in the tradition of dream interpretation variously represented in *Genesis* and *Daniel* and also in certain rabbinic writings or at least in the broader category of apocalyptic of which *Daniel* is seen to be a part. (35) Thus K. ELLIGER compares the *pesharim* with the interpretations in *Daniel*, (36) as does F. F. BRUCE; (37) O. BETZ notes the formal links with dream interpretation in his generic description of *peshet*, (38) L. H. SILBERMAN compares the *pesharim* favourably with the *Petirah* midrash, (39) A. FINKEL cites further biblical and non-biblical examples of dream interpretation, (40) M. P. MILLER extends the category of dream to include certain visions and prophetic material, as do F. DAUMAS, J. CARMIGNAC and D. PATTE, (41) I. RABINOWITZ bases his whole investigation on such an identification even including texts from the Assyrian Dream Book for his purposes (42) and, to conclude this brief sample of authors, M. DELCOR makes reference to "l'interprétation des songes". (43)

Although there is agreement to a lesser or greater extent on this point of the tradition in which the *pesharim* belong, this brief and necessarily selective summary of the history of scholarship shows considerable disagreement to the present time concerning the definition of *peshet*. However, it seems that the variations depend not so much on the a priori presuppositions of particular

(35) See W. H. BROWNLEE, *The Midrash Peshet of Habakkuk*, Introduction; *The Background of Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*, pp. 183-185.

(36) *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer* (Tübingen, 1953), pp. 156-57.

(37) *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts* (Den Haag, 1959), pp. 59-65.

(38) *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte* (Tübingen, 1960), pp. 77-78.

(39) *Unriddling the Riddle*, p. 329.

(40) *The Peshet of Dreams and Scriptures*, in *Revue de Qumran* 4 (1963-1964), pp. 357-70.

(41) *Targum, Midrash and the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament*, in *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 2 (1971), pp. 52-54; F. DAUMAS, *Littérature prophétique et exégétique égyptienne et commentaires esséniens*, in *Memorial Albert Gelin* (Le Puy, 1961), pp. 203-231; J. CARMIGNAC, *Le genre littéraire du 'Peshet' dans la Pistis-Sophia*, in *Revue de Qumran* 4 (1963-1964), pp. 497-522; D. PATTE, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine* (Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 22; Missoula, 1975), pp. 300-302.

(42) *Peshet/Pittarôn*, pp. 220-226, 229-231.

(43) *Les Pesharim ou les Commentaires qumraniens*, col. 905.

scholars as to what constitutes peshar, but more on the basis of how any literary genre is to be defined, the criteria used for such a definition. Thus, before attempting to offer some remarks hinting at a way forward in the debate, it is necessary to consider the very task of the ascertainment of literary genres. This will be done in the next section with reference to the pesharim throughout.

III. The Determination of Genres

The determination of genres is highly problematic for not only is there disagreement as to the method to be used for such determination, but also it is far from clear what precisely genre is itself. Discussion of these topics is increasing rapidly particularly in the field of structuralism and structural exegesis, but perhaps the simplest way of seeing some way forward in the debate about the genre of the pesharim is to begin with the history of scholarship already described. Although there may be some falsification through oversimplification in the representation of scholarly opinions, it seems that in each case the scholar has come to his generic conclusion concerning peshar on the basis of one criterion alone, even though often others may complement it; in other words some single item, either form or structure or content or setting (44) or authorship, has been made the ultimate determining factor (45) for that author's understanding of the genre peshar.

Such an approach is indeed the majority position of biblical form criticism and is even programmatic in a recent methodological statement: "The typicality of a text, its text-type, can depend on one or another of the various factors which form criticism has regarded as representative of the typical. It depends on *which* factor is ultimately constitutive of a text." (46) Yet KNIERIM in this same article denies the usefulness of a traditional "monolithic conception of genre." (47)

Three points are visible from such discussion of genre. The first is that while it may often be the case that one factor ultimately determines the genre of a unit of literature, it may also be the case that rather than other factors being secondary, they may interact

(44) Almost the sole determining factor in the treatment of Qumran exegesis, including peshar, by F. F. BRUCE, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*, pp. 18-27.

(45) Factor is not used here in any quasi-mathematical sense, but simply to denote that which may determine a genre.

(46) R. KNIERIM, *Old Testament Form Criticism Reconsidered*, in *Interpretation* 27 (1973), p. 463 (italics his).

(47) *OT Form Criticism Reconsidered*, p. 467.

in a more complex way with such a determining factor so that it becomes impossible to order such factors hierarchically. Although it may seem that it would be easy to determine the ultimate typical factor for text-types, for example, setting for the sermon, author for the court sentence, form for the acrostic psalm or letter, content for a gospel, or function for the ticket, frequently it is impossible to separate these factors so neatly. If, for example, an author has a certain point to make and decides to write an acrostic poem to do so, one might fairly ask whether it is the content or the form that determines his use of words. Similarly to what extent does the form of pesharim depend upon the presence of the actual word פֶּשֶׁר in some formula? A. ALONSO-SCHÖKEL has stated the problem clearly in his proposition that "the perfect separation between form and content is, in fact, impossible." (48)

As already implied concerning the pesharim it is clear that the generic description of these works by that name is attributable to the very word פֶּשֶׁר used in them. Indeed, as E. D. HIRSCH has pointed out, "without helpful orientations like titles and attributions, readers are likely to gain widely different generic conceptions of a text, and these conceptions will be constitutive of their subsequent understanding." (49) But even such keys are open to misunderstanding and the uncertainty of interpretation remains. In the next section we will try to show how when form and content are taken together, the absolute use of the word pesharim generically falls into the background until considered as the designation of a subtype, which, as HIRSCH again describes, may be such not because of a particular vocabulary or sentence pattern but because of a particular purpose. (50)

The second point which this consideration of the determination of genres brings to the fore is that which has belonged largely to the realm of literary criticism. While it may be allowed that one or more factors can be constitutive of a genre according to biblical (and other) criticism, the literary critics have suggested that alongside these "primary" characteristics there are "secondary" ones of a different order which play a necessary part in making precise any generic definition. Thus R. WELLEK and A. WARREN, in their widely-quoted work *Theory of Literature*, (51) describe

(48) *Hermeneutical Problems of a Literary Study of the Bible*, in *Congress Volume, Edinburgh 1974, Velus Testamentum Supplement 28* (Leiden, 1975), p. 7.

(49) *Validity in Interpretation* (New Haven/London, 1967), p. 75.

(50) *Validity in Interpretation*, p. 100; for a good description of the purpose of pesharim see the final section of the introduction in W. H. BROWNLEE's *The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk*.

(51) *Theory of Literature* (New York, 1956), p. 231; used, for example, by C. H. TALBERT, *What is a Gospel?* (London, 1978), pp. 6, 20, 21.

how genres ought to be based upon both inner and outer forms together: "The ostensible basis may be one or the other (e.g. "pastoral" and "satire" for the inner form; dipodic verse and Pindaric ode for outer); but the critical problem will then be to find the *other* dimension, to complete the diagram." (52) It does not seem to be the case that "inner" form describes content, while "outer" describes form. Rather what we would call "primary" factors (form, content, author, setting, function, etc.) need to be put alongside factors of a different order, "secondary (inner) factors" that are chiefly stylistic.

It is the determining of the difference between these two kinds of factor that may prove the difficult issue. Put simplistically, however, one may begin to observe the difference in seeing primary factors as descriptive of and determinative of the end product of an author and secondary factors as categorizing the method used in attaining that product; thus these secondary factors may be apparent in the end product itself. Some such distinction is made implicitly by R. LE DÉAUT in his criticism of A. G. WRIGHT's book, *The Literary Genre Midrash*. LE DÉAUT stresses chiefly that WRIGHT's brief, and therefore his book's title, are too narrow: "The title 'Midrash as a Literary Genre' would have made it possible for WRIGHT to preserve the other meanings of midrash." (53) These other meanings are partly encompassed in the very task of midrash: "one may ask whether exegetical method is not a more fundamental criterion for recognizing midrash than is literary form." (54) So for the pesharim too their method of construction must be investigated as part of their generic classification.

Thirdly, even from an ahistorical synchronic structuralist viewpoint, it is clear that generic definition depends upon the use of texts other than that being categorized. Thus D. O. VIA can write: "the genre is constructed by abstracting from several works a number of traits which they have in common (though these traits may appear as variations or transformations of each other) and which are deemed to be more important than other traits which they do not have in common." (55) For the non-structuralist, however, the use of other texts in determining genre depends upon their being treated diachronically. Texts are

(52) Cited by B. C. LEE in *A Dictionary of Modern Critical Terms*, ed. R. FOWLER (London/Boston, 1973), pp. 82-83.

(53) *Apropos a Definition of Midrash*, p. 265, n. 17.

(54) *Apropos a Definition of Midrash*, p. 273.

(55) *A Structuralist Approach to Paul's Old Testament Hermeneutic*, in *Interpretation* 28 (1974), pp. 203-205. "For structuralism the set, genre, or structure does not have a single 'true' or 'earlier' version. Rather it is made up of all of its versions or transformations" (p. 205).

ordered historically and the history of traditions established. (56) We have seen that as far as this point is concerned there is some considerable agreement that the pesharim are in some way related to the history of textual interpretation represented in the Jewish traditions of dream interpretation. SILBERMAN makes this point succinctly: "It may well be that the *Pesher* lies athwart a line of development leading from the midrashic presuppositions already at work in *Daniel* to the formal structure of the *Petirah*." (57)

In sum, in applying these observations to the pesharim and the broader context of material containing biblical interpretation at Qumran, it must be remembered especially that form and content may be inseparable primary factors, that secondary factors are involved and require discussion, and that the history of literary traditions cannot be ignored. These three items will aid us towards redefining the genre peshar at Qumran.

IV. Peshar

1 Q p Hab VII, 3-5, reads: "And as for that which he said, 'That he who reads it may run,' interpreted this concerns the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom God made known all the mysteries of the words of his servants the prophets." Understandably this has been taken to mean that the pesharim have received their interpretation through the divine inspiration of the Teacher of Righteousness. As such the pesharim may indeed be beyond human scrutiny. But taking it for granted that both God and the Teacher of Righteousness wanted both biblical text and interpretation to be understood and accepted by a particular audience, it becomes necessary to attempt to discern how such an overall aim was achieved. In other words, the most appropriate starting point in making the pesharim intelligible, which is the aim of our discussing their generic classification at all, is to begin with what we have described in the previous section as a secondary factor in determining genre.

A brief look at Qumran material where there is interpretation of scriptural passages (apart from the pesharim) points us to this secondary factor. For example, the *Amos-Numbers* Midrash (*Dam. Doc. VII, 13-18*) reads: "And all the apostates were given up to the sword, but those who held fast escaped to the land of the north as he said, 'I will exile the tabernacle of (SKWR) your king and the bases of (KYWN) your statues from my tent to Damascus'"

(56) "The real relationship of an intrinsic genre to broader genre ideas is a historical relationship," E. D. HIRSCH, *Validity in Interpretation*, p. 110.

(57) *Unriddling the Riddle*, p. 329.

(*Amos* 5, 26-27). The books of the Law are the tabernacle of (SWKT) the king, as he said, "I will raise up the tabernacle of (SWKT) David which is fallen" (*Amos* 9, 11)." The tabernacle or *sikkuth* (MT; depending upon how one vocalizes it) of *Amos* 5, 27 is first of all identified with the books of the Law and then explained by a quotation from *Amos* 9, 11 which analogically uses the same word, *sukkath*. It could be maintained then that the interpreter of *Amos* 5, 27 intended the text to be understood as saying that in Damascus, whether actually or metaphorically, God will restore the Law to its proper place. The two quotations from *Amos* are linked through *gezērâ šāwâ*, SKWT being read and taken as SWKT.

Yet more than that device is at work in this short passage. To start with, the quotation from *Amos* 5 is composite. The first word is from *Amos* 5, 27; we can therefore suppose that it is that verse which is cited. Through *nôṭariqôn* 'TKM (*Amos* 5, 27; not *Dam. Doc.* VII, 14) is taken as an inclusive abbreviation of phrases from the previous verse: two are included at this point, 'T SKWT MLKKM and 'T KYWN ṢLMYKM. The phrase concerning the star is not included since it cannot fully subscribe to the same exegetical device, even though later in the interpretation the star becomes the subject of concern (*Dam. Doc.* VII, 18-21). In any case the phrase mentioning the star is appositional in MT to the second phrase above which is included in *Dam. Doc.* (58) Also the MT's MHL'H L is altered to M'HL'Y, a possible use of 'al *liqrē*' to produce an understanding such as that proposed by C. RABIN, "From my tent to Damascus." (59) These various explanations of the *Amos* text as cited in *Dam. Doc.* seem far preferable to some such comment as R. H. CHARLES' to the effect that *Dam. Doc.*'s differences from the MT are due to the accidents of copyists. (60)

More could be said of our example from *Dam. Doc.*, (61) but

(58) At least according to MT; *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* supposes that KWKB 'LHYKM is an addendum. In the Septuagint (= *Acts* 7, 43) the order is altered such that Μολοχ and Παφαν (the star god) are described as idols. *Syr.* has a different order again. If the phrase KWKB 'LHYKM 'SR 'SYTM LKM is taken as a whole, then it may have been omitted purposely because of its negative significance.

(59) *The Zadokite Documents* (Oxford, 1954), p. 28; followed by G. VERMES, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* (Studia Post-Biblica 4; Leiden, 1973, 2nd ed.), p. 45.

(60) *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (vol. II; Oxford, 1913), p. 816. CHARLES concedes that the change of verbs at the beginning of the line is deliberate; but this is negated if we allow some such description of the matter as proposed here: it is verse 27 that is quoted, not verse 26.

(61) I would merely refer to RABIN's work and to my dissertation (see note 8), pp. 333-338, and my article *The Amos-Numbers Midrash (CD 7: 13b-8: 1a) and Messianic Expectation*, forthcoming in the *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*.

it is preferable to cite an example of such secondary factors from the cave materials themselves. *4 Q Flor*, I, 1-13, not peshar, contains another example of an analogical quotation: *Amos* 9, 11 is used to explain *II Samuel* 7, 11-14, because of the occurrence of WHQYMWTY in both texts. (62) Also in *4 Q Flor*, I, 12-13 the technique of *ma'al* is present: *SWKT* of *Amos* 9, 11 could be taken to mean both "tabernacle" and "branch" whereby the identification of the shoot of David is confirmed. In respect of this example several rabbinic parallels to the use of such a midrashic device have already been provided by L. H. SILBERMAN. (63)

To pass to the pesharim proper is to suggest that there too this secondary generic factor is to be discovered. In fact many scholars have discussed the presence of midrashic techniques there (64) and conclude typically that to achieve his purposes the exegete allegorically interprets the significant words of the biblical text and that "he further employs dual-reading, dual meaning of a word and word-splitting to unveil the hidden meaning of the text." (65) It is generally agreed also that these midrashic devices and techniques belong to rabbinic as well as to various Qumran sources. (66) Indeed the very variety of such sources including not just the pesharim, shows clearly that the discerning of such devices alone cannot be the determining factor in any generic description of the pesharim. And yet as a secondary factor in our understanding of peshar they are an important clue in helping towards a correct generic definition.

That these devices are not constitutive of the genre peshar can be argued further from the fact that it is sometimes, if not often, nigh on impossible to determine which device is in use for any one passage. For example, to return to *1 Q p Hab VII*, 3-5, W. H. BROWNLEE cites at least six ways in which the inter-

(62) See E. SLOMOVIC, *Toward an Understanding of the Exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, in *Revue de Qumran* 7 (1969-71), p. 8. SLOMOVIC also treats other examples of *gezêrâ šawâ* in *4 Q Flor*, and names other midrashic exegetical devices at work in some of the interpretative passages of the scrolls.

(63) *A Note on 4 Q Florilegium*, in *Journal of Biblical Literature* 78 (1959), pp. 158-159.

(64) Most notably, W. H. BROWNLEE, *Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, in *Biblical Archaeologist* 14 (1951), pp. 54-76, and *The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk*; K. ELLIGER, *Studien zum Habakkuk-Kommentar*, pp. 118-164; L. H. SILBERMAN, *Unriddling the Riddle*, pp. 323-364; E. SLOMOVIC, *Toward an Understanding of the Exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 7-8, 13-15; D. PATTE, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine*, pp. 303-308 (follows BROWNLEE and SILBERMAN very closely).

(65) A. FINKEL, *The Peshar of Dreams and Scriptures*, p. 370.

(66) For an explanation of various technical terms and for many examples of their use in rabbinic texts see W. BACHER, *Die exegetische Terminologie der Jüdischen Traditionsliteratur* (Leipzig, I, 1899; II, 1905).

pretation ("the interpretation concerns the Righteous Teacher to whom God has made known all the mysteries of the words of his servants the prophets") may be derived from the text, "for the sake of him who reads it" (or, "that he who reads it (67) may run"; (68) all this apart from the many ways in which the text of *Habakkuk* 2, 2 can itself be understood! a) Firstly there is the simple allegorical understanding of the phrase: the Teacher of Righteousness is he above all others who may 'run' as a prophetic messenger, reading his message as he runs. b) There is the possible use of a secondary derivation of $\Upsilon\text{RW}\mathfrak{S}$ by analogy with $\text{P}\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{S}$ from the root $\text{R}\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{S}$ meaning "to crush, shatter" and by implication, "to interpret." (69) c) There may be a verbal play involving the root $\text{TR}\mathfrak{S}$ which in *Yebamot* 11b-12a means "interpret." (70) d) The text may be read, deliberately or otherwise, as $\Upsilon\text{RY}\mathfrak{S}$ because of *Wāw-Yod* confusion in the scrolls, and therefore the verb is a hiphil to be derived from the root $\text{R}\mathfrak{S}\text{H}$, "to arrange subjects for debate, to discourse." e) This reading may in turn have been punned as $\Upsilon\text{LY}\mathfrak{S}$, "he may interpret." (71) f) A verbal play on the letters $\text{R}\mathfrak{S}$ may have suggested the interpretation's rz.

Such a variety of possibilities allows no precision in the use of midrashic techniques for generic definition for we are far from knowing what limits were imposed on the use of such devices and therefore of knowing amongst other things whether the passage concerned could fall within the category of valid interpretation. And yet these characteristics remain functional in generic definition when considered alongside a primary factor.

Because we have noted that the content of peshar appears variable within the scope of there being biblical quotation and interpretation, it is consideration of that structural combination that we shall use to describe our primary factor, remembering all the while the ultimate inseparability of form and content and that what have come to be known as the pesharim deal with prophetic texts.

The structure of *Dam. Doc.* VII, 14b-21a is as follows: (72)

- I. Quotation of *Amos* 5, 27 with insertion of 5, 26a α 2- β (with an introductory formula)

(67) Reading the supralinear $\Upsilon\text{RW}\mathfrak{S}$.

(68) *The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk*, Section 20.

(69) SILBERMAN, *Unriddling the Riddle*, pp. 344-345, appeals to *Bab. Talmud*, *Sanhedrin* 34a for this.

(70) SILBERMAN, *Unriddling the Riddle*, p. 345.

(71) BROWNLEE compares $\text{M}\text{L}\text{Y}\mathfrak{S}$ D^{T} in *4 Q P Ps^s* I, 19.

(72) It is assumed that the reader has a suitable text available.

II. Interpretation

A. Concerning SKWT MLKKM

1. Identification : SPRY HTWRH HM SWKT HMLK
2. Two explanations : K'SR HQHL
 - a. Comparison : K'SR HNWPLT
 - 1) Introductory formula : K'SR 'MR
 - 2) Quotation : *Amos* 9, 11a
 - b. Identification : HMLK HW' HQHL

B. Concerning KYWN ŠLMYKM

1. Identification : KYWN HŠLMYM HM SPRY HNBV'YM
2. Explanation (relative clause) : 'ŠR DBRYHM

C. Concerning HKWKB

1. Identification : HKWKB HW' DWRŠ HTWRH
2. Explanation (relative clause) : HB' BNY ŠT.

J. MURPHY-O'CONNOR has elsewhere justified the taking of these lines as a unit in themselves. (73) The structural outline shows clearly that the passage contains two parts, the biblical quotation and its interpretation. The interpretation itself is of three parts, each part dealing with a separate section of the initial quotation. (74) More significantly each part of the interpretation has two elements which can be described most adequately as a statement of identification and a statement (or statements) of explanation, taking the form of a relative or dependent clause. It is noteworthy that the statement of identification contains the extract of the original text to be commented upon but sometimes in an amended form to suit the interpreter's purposes.

The same structure can also be seen in *4 Q Flor*, I, 10-13, and by implication elsewhere in *4 Q Flor*:

- I. Quotations from *II Samuel* 7 (MT: *II Sam* 7, 11b, 12a β , 13b, 14a)

II. Interpretation

A. Identification: HW'H ŠMH DWYD

B. Explanation (relative clause)

1. Basic statement with temporal phrase : H'WMD
HYMYM

(73) *A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document* VI, 2-VIII, 3, in *Revue Biblique* 78 (1971), pp. 210-232; *The Original Text of CD 7:9-8:2=19:5-14*, in *Harvard Theological Review* 64 (1971), pp. 384-386.

(74) Though KWKB is not actually quoted in the citation.

2. Comparative quotation with interpretation : K'SR
 YSR'L
- a. Quotation of *Amos* 9, 11 with introductory formula
 - b. Interpretation
 - 1) Identification : HY'H SWKT DWYD HNWPLT
 - 2) Explanation (relative clause).

This structural outline is so similar to that of *Dam. Doc. VII*, 14b-21a that little comment need be made. Two points are significant. Firstly, it is interesting to see that even the interpretation of a subordinate quotation which is part of the main explanation is structurally the same as its parent unit. Secondly, it is important to note that whereas in *Dam. Doc. VII* the statement of identification contained a re-quotation of some of the scriptural quotation before the pronoun acting as a verb, in *4 Q Flor* there is no re-quotation and the pronoun introduces the subject of the identification immediately: this is significant because it now seems that the pronoun may act in a way similar to the more complex formulae using the word PŠR.

Turning to *1 Q p Hab*, the most complete commentary, to which reference has already been made, it is noteworthy that yet again the same structure of biblical quotation and interpretation appears. For example, the structure of *1 Q p Hab VI*, 8-12 is:

I. Quotation of *Hab.* 1, 17

II. Interpretation

A. Identification: PŠRW 'L HKTY'YM

B. Explanation (relative clause) : 'ŠR YRHMW

The two parts of the interpretation are clear; in relation to what has already been described and quite apart from the grammatical difficulties there may be with the word PŠR in its various formulae, it might be fairly concluded that the formula PŠRW is an alternative expression within the tradition of dream interpretation for the restatement of the quotation in combination with a pronoun (either personal or demonstrative), (75) or more simply an alternative for the pronoun alone, though in both cases the introductory word (pronoun) or phrase (PŠRW 'L) may refer to the whole of the identification and explanation.

This difficulty in defining the structural function of the formulae containing the word PŠR is brought into focus by the variety of structures apparent in *1 Q p Hab* itself, a commentary that appears

(75) See L. H. SILBERMAN, *Unriddling the Riddle*, p. 329, for further detail on this point.

uniform. For example at *I Q p Hab* VI, 2-5 the structure appears as follows:

I. Requotation of *Hab. 1*, 16a with introductory formula.

II. Interpretation

A. Formulaic introduction : PŠRW 'ŠR

B. Identifications and explanations : HMM.....RBWT

1. HMM ZBH_YM.....

2. HMM MWR'M.....

This section is only part of a unit but even here can be seen the familiar two-part structure of quotation and interpretation. It is more difficult to be precise concerning the structure of the interpretation. It might be claimed that all that remained of the statement of identification was the formulaic PŠRW and that 'ŠR then introduced the relative clause of the statement of explanation. Alternatively it seems that the identification made earlier in the column is maintained in the pronoun and that therefore PŠRW 'ŠR is a formulaic introduction to a combination of statements of implied identification and explanation. This latter option is taken here.

A final example, again illustrating slight structural variety, is *I Q p Hab. XII*, 1-10:

I. Quotation of *Hab. 2*, 17

II. Interpretation

A. Concerning the Wicked Priest: PŠR HDBR 'L.....'BYWNYM

1. Identification: PŠR HDBR 'L HKWHN HRŠ'

2. Explanations (dependent clauses)

a. Concerning reward: LŠLM.....'BYWNYM

b. Concerning Lebanon and beasts: KY'.....HTWRH

c. Concerning poor : 'ŠR.....'BYWNYM

B. Concerning the cities: W'ŠR.....'BYWNYM

1. Requotation with introductory formula

2. Interpretations

a. First interpretation

1) Identification: PŠRW HQR_YH HY' YRWŠLM

2) Explanation: 'ŠR.....MQDŠ 'L

b. Second interpretation

1) Identification: WHMS 'RŠ HMM 'RY YHWDH

2) Explanation: 'ŠR.....'BYWNYM.

Here again there is a basic structure of quotation and interpretation. The interpretation is in two parts, the second of which begins

with a re quotation after an introductory formula, thereby confirming yet again the basic structure seen elsewhere in *I Q p Hab.* and in the other examples already cited. Again some distinctive points can be noted: in the interpretation concerning the Wicked Priest the three statements of explanation, all dependent clauses, show the variety with which such explanation can be made; the two statements of identification in the section concerning the cities show variety too, for even the words that are re quoted (QRYH and WHMS 'RS) can have their identification expressed syntactically with the aid of the pronoun and not some formula containing the word PŠR. It may be the case that the formulae in *I Q p Hab.*, XII, 2 (PŠR HDBR 'L) and in XII, 7 (PŠRW) cover the whole of their respective interpretations but, even allowing that that may be so, there is some variety in the handling of the biblical material in this section of *I Q p Hab.* At the least this structural investigation has pointed to a basic structure of quotation and interpretation; in the interpretation the various formulae containing the word PŠR can be used in a variety of ways. Indeed variety in the very meaning of PŠR at Qumran has already been pointed to. (76) Furthermore in many Qumran texts where the basic structure of prophetic quotation and interpretation is present no use is made of the formulae containing PŠR to introduce the identification in the interpretation.

It is unnecessary to rehearse at this point all the arguments of scholars concerning the third aspect, the tradition history, for the completion of our generic definition. Suffice it to say that on the one hand considerable work has already been done in the fields of dream and vision interpretation which traditions certainly include some of the rabbinic midrashim, and on the other hand that the Qumran Teacher of Righteousness and his followers must not be considered in a vacuum. Indeed, if such an oftquoted definition of midrash as that of R. BLOCH is taken into account, then the affinities with what we have described can no longer be denied. She proposes a five-point definition:

"1) Its point of departure is Scripture; it is a reflection or meditation on the Bible.

2) It is homiletical and largely originates from the liturgical reading of the Torah.

3) It makes punctilious analysis of the text, with the object of illuminating any obscurities found there. Every effort is made to explain the Bible by the Bible, as a rule not arbitrarily but by exploiting a theme.

(76) As also for the use of the word and its cognates outside Qumran literature.

4) The Biblical message is adapted to suit contemporary needs.

5) According to the nature of the Biblical text, the midrash either tries to discover the basic principles inherent in the legal sections with the aim of solving problems not dealt with in Scripture (*halakah*); or it sets out to find the true significance of events mentioned in the narrative sections of the Pentateuch (*haggadah*).” (77)

BLOCH's first point covers the structural factor cited above, which structure, of course, is based on the content of the two parts: Scripture and interpretation. The second point deals with the setting and would no doubt require refinement in light of the fifth point which is more restrictive than BLOCH's setting might allow; (78) these two points taken together, however, are what confines BLOCH's definition to rabbinic midrash. The third point expresses succinctly the material described in this article under the secondary factor of method. The fourth point would be disputed as appropriate for rabbinic midrash by some scholars, (79) but it is clearly present as part of the aim of the Qumran writings.

In sum, providing it is recognized that midrash as literary genre is now a broad enough category to require qualification in every instance as to its provenance (e.g., rabbinic, New Testament, etc.), we may conclude that the commentaries through their combination of primary (structural) and secondary (methodological) factors are to be properly classified as *Qumran midrash*. Consequently, to use the word *peshet* as a generic classification, in association with midrash, in anything like its translation (i.e. “interpretation”) is purely tautological. (80) At worst, to use the description *peshet* with no reference to midrash unnecessarily multiplies generic categories through scholarly invention. At best, *peshet* can be retained in an extended sense only, of its usually implying an interpretation of a prophetic text. (81) In “continuous” interpretations the actual word פֶּשֶׁת appears to have some formulaic significance, the importance of which is not yet clearly

(77) *Midrash*, in *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible* (vol. V, Paris, 1957), coll. 1265-1267; as translated, paraphrased and largely supported by G. VERMES, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* (Leiden, 1961), p. 7.

(78) See R. LE DÉAUT, *Apropos a Definition of Midrash*, p. 282, n. 85: “The sub-genres of midrash are many when they are classed according to content (aggadic midrash, halakhic midrash, historical narrative, didactic, ethical, allegorical, mystic, apocalyptic) or according to literary form (*peshet*, liturgical midrash with homily, piyyut, aggadic narration...)”

(79) E.g., SILBERMAN, *Unriddling the Riddle*, p. 329.

(80) E.g., as in W. H. BROWNLEE's recent *The Midrash Peshet of Habakkuk*.

(81) This then is the subcategory which CARMIGNAC (*Le Document de Qumran sur Melkisédeq*, p. 360) neatly designates as “continu.”

known in relation to genre. In "thematic" Qumran midrashim the function of such formulae is variable and cannot be declared definitively for the purposes of the definition of a genre.

Until such time as further evidence, such as proof that the word PŠR in Qumran tradition is used of material from the lips of the Teacher of Righteousness alone, negates these conclusions, CARMIGNAC's distinction between "continu" and "thématique" will remain and the Qumran commentaries be seen as an example of early Jewish midrash because of their structure and their method. So peshar as commonly understood is no more than a sub-genre, and it may well be preferable to drop the word and all its associated complications that are too often forgotten, and to talk rather of *Qumran midrashim* which contain "fulfilment interpretation of prophecy" (82) whilst insisting upon their connection with the midrashic traditions of dream interpretation (83).

George BROOKE.

(82) VERMES' phrase; see note (7).

(83) M. P. HORGAN's work on the Qumran commentaries (*Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series, 8), Washington, 1979) reached me too late for consideration in this article. In her discussion of genre (pp. 229-259) she covers the word PŠR and its associated formulas, the structure, methods of interpretation and content of the pesharim and their relationship with other writings, but she does not consider the methodological questions which this article has attempted to raise concerning what constitutes any genre and as a result her conclusions are noticeably and avowedly tentative.