



BRILL

*Dead Sea Discoveries* 15 (2008) 380–395

Discoveries

[www.brill.nl/dsd](http://www.brill.nl/dsd)

## 4Q372 1 and the Continuation of Joseph's Exile<sup>1</sup>

**Matthew Thiessen**

208-A Watts St, Durham, NC 27701, USA

[matthew.thiessen@duke.edu](mailto:matthew.thiessen@duke.edu)

---

### Abstract

It has been argued that the fragment 4Q372 1 contains polemic against the Samaritans and their temple cult at Gerizim. While allusions to Samaritans are found in the text, their presence signifies to the restored southern tribes that their restoration is not yet complete. Since the northern tribes, represented by the person of Joseph, remain in foreign lands, the promised deliverance of Deut 32 remains unfulfilled. In contrast to those in the south who might be tempted to conclude, with Ps 78, that God had rejected Joseph, 4Q372 1 suggests that the south's fate is inextricably intertwined with Joseph's fate.

### Keywords

4Q372; Deut 32; Exile; Joseph; Ps 78; Restoration; Samaritans

### Introduction

Amongst the many fragmentary scrolls found within the caves surrounding Khirbet Qumran was found an enigmatic work, existing in five extant manuscripts, currently known by the rather nondescript title *4QNarrative and Poetic Composition*.<sup>2</sup> The work is indeed diverse enough to make its

---

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to Eileen Schuller and Loren T. Stuckenbruck for their helpful comments on this paper and to James M. Scott for introducing me to this work.

<sup>2</sup> The critical edition of 4Q371–373 is Eileen Schuller and Moshe Bernstein, “4QNarrative and Poetic Composition<sup>a-c</sup>,” *DJD* 28:151–204. A critical edition of the 2Q22 fragment is Maurice Baillet, *DJD* 3:81–82. Eibert Tigchelaar has identified a fifth manuscript of the work in the fragments of PAM 43.680 frgs. 1–3, “On the Unidentified Fragments of *DJD* XXXIII and PAM 43.680: A New

classification problematic, a difficulty compounded by uncertainty as to how the various fragments relate one to another. The largest fragment, 4Q372 1, which is the object of study within this paper, contains thirty-two lines and focuses on the figure of Joseph,<sup>3</sup> referring to him twice within the narrative section of the fragment (lines 1–15a) and portraying him as the speaker of the poetic section (lines 15b–32). As Eileen Schuller concedes, since the fragmentary nature of the manuscripts makes it impossible to relate this fragment convincingly to the rest of the work, “[a]t least at present we have to try to make sense of the Joseph fragment without much help from its context within the total manuscript.”<sup>4</sup>

#### 4Q372 1: A Fragment of An Anti-Samaritan Work?

Schuller’s own effort to make sense of the Joseph fragment can be found most fully in her study entitled “4Q372 1: A Text about Joseph,” wherein she argues that “4Q372 1 is a specifically anti-Samaritan text, that is directed against the Jewish community around Shechem with its cultic centre at Mount Gerizim.”<sup>5</sup> To substantiate this hypothesis, Schuller argues that in 4Q372 1, Joseph does not signify the son of Jacob who is the central figure of the latter chapters of Genesis, but rather signifies the northern kingdom of Israel, a possibility that is strongly supported by such a usage elsewhere.<sup>6</sup> Given this meaning, it is necessary “to explain why anyone in

---

Manuscript of *4QNarrative and Poetic Composition*, and Fragments of *4Q13*, *4Q269*, *4Q525* and *4Q5b(?)*,” *RevQ* 21/83 (2004): 477–85 at 481–83.

<sup>3</sup> 4Q371 1a–b contains two sections that overlap with 4Q372 1: 4Q371 1a–b 1–13 corresponds to 4Q372 1 5–14; 4Q371 2 1–2 corresponds to 4Q372 1 23. Schuller and Bernstein argue, on the basis of John Strugnell’s initial study of the manuscripts, that 4Q371 evidences a semi-formal Hasmonean hand and should be dated to 100–75 B.C.E., whereas 4Q372 is late Hasmonean/early Herodian and should be dated to *c.* 50 B.C.E.

<sup>4</sup> Eileen Schuller, “4Q372 1: A Text about Joseph,” *RevQ* 14/55 (1990): 349–76 at 350. Cf. Schuller and Bernstein, *DJD* 28:151–54.

<sup>5</sup> Schuller, “4Q372 1: A Text about Joseph,” 371. For a similar conclusion, see Schuller and Bernstein, *DJD* 28:171–72.

<sup>6</sup> Biblical examples of such a meaning for Joseph are numerous: Ps 77:16; 78:67; 80:2; 81:5; Amos 5:6, 15; 6:6; Ezek 37:15–23; Zech 10:6–10. See also the pseudepigraphical work *T. Naph.* 5–6. Florentino García Martínez, “Nuevos Textos no Bíblicos procedentes de Qumrán,” *EstBib* 49 (1991): 97–134 at 121–22,

the Persian-Hellenistic period was so interested in Joseph = northern tribes.<sup>7</sup> The answer, according to Schuller, is found in the fact that the Samaritans claimed to be descendants of Joseph.<sup>8</sup> That is to say, in response to the Samaritan claim to descendancy from Joseph, the author writes 4Q372 1 as a demonstration that their claims are false. In further support of her claim of an anti-Samaritan polemic, Schuller notes that the reference to a foolish people (גבלים) in 4Q371 1a–b 10 (corresponding to line 11 of 4Q372 1) would have been understood to refer to the Samaritans in light of other references to the Samaritans as fools.<sup>9</sup> The final reason adduced for understanding the fragment as part of an anti-Samaritan document is that this foolish people sets up a high place (במה) on a high mountain (הר גבה) (4Q372 1 12), a site which Schuller identifies as Mount Gerizim.<sup>10</sup> Thus, 4Q372 1 provides a window into “inner Jewish polemics and rivalry in the Second Temple Period.”<sup>11</sup>

argues that both the historical Joseph and Joseph as the northern kingdom are signified here.

<sup>7</sup> Schuller, “4Q372 1: A Text about Joseph,” 369.

<sup>8</sup> Schuller, “4Q372 1: A Text about Joseph,” 374. Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 9.291; 11.341. *Gen. Rab.* 94:6 argues that the Samaritans are not descended from Joseph but from Issachar. Schuller also refers to the collection of Samaritan texts found in James D. Purvis, “Joseph in the Samaritan Traditions,” in *Studies on the Testament of Joseph* (ed. George Nickelsburg; SCS 5; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1975), 147–53, which demonstrates such a Samaritan self-understanding.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Sir 50:26 (Ms B): וגוי נבל הדר בשכם; *T. Levi* 7:2 says that Shechem is “the city of fools.”

<sup>10</sup> Schuller, “4Q372 1: A Text about Joseph,” 372, originally argued that Gerizim was the specific identity of the במה based on the claim that in 4Q372 1 “the charge is expressed in the singular, whereas the biblical accusation is always plural.” Her most recent comments in Schuller and Bernstein, *DJD* 28:175, indicate awareness of biblical examples of the singular use of במה. Cf. 1 Kgs 11:7; 2 Kgs 23:15; Isa 16:12; Jer 48:35; Ezek 20:29. Robert A. Kugler, “Joseph at Qumran: The Importance of 4Q372 frg. 1 in Extending a Tradition,” in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich* (ed. Peter W. Flint et al.; VTSup 101; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 261–78 at 274–75, attempts to show how this fragment of the work may have been interpreted by the Qumran community, suggesting that the Qumranites could have interpreted this as a reference to the Jerusalem Temple so as to coincide with their own stance against the temple leadership.

<sup>11</sup> Schuller, “4Q372 1: A Text About Joseph,” 376. These polemics appear to be unrelated to the polemics found within the sectarian scrolls, as Schuller and

### 4Q372 and the Fate of Joseph

Schuller concludes her study of 4Q372 1 with the “hope that this preliminary publication of the text can serve to stimulate discussion and further study of this most interesting text,”<sup>12</sup> a desire greatly facilitated by her treatment (in collaboration with Moshe Bernstein) of 4Q371–373 in the *DJD* series. Her hypothesis has done much to secure interest in, and provide a basis for, further discussion of the work, and although much of Schuller’s hypothesis is convincing and informs the argument of this paper, I would, nonetheless, like to suggest a different hypothesis about the intended purpose of the text. While the Samaritans are likely the intended reference of the foolish people who builds a *במה*, and this *במה* refers to the cultic center on Gerizim, it will be argued that by reading the fragment as part of a work that is *primarily* an anti-Samaritan treatise, the main issue—Joseph’s continuing exile—is consigned to the periphery. This can be seen in Schuller’s own conclusion to her initial study: “Given the dynamics of religious polemic, it is not necessary to claim that our author had any special knowledge, *or even real interest in*, the ‘ten lost tribes’; the important factor is that if ‘Joseph’ is really in exile, the Samaritan claim to be descendants of Joseph is spurious.”<sup>13</sup> It is the contention of this paper that, while the fragment contains negative references to the Samaritans, this is done to serve the very different purpose of arguing for the significance of the true Joseph’s continuing exile.

The interpretation of 4Q372 1 10–14 is central to demonstrating the significance of the continuing exile of Joseph (i.e., the northern tribes). As

---

Bernstein argue, *DJD* 28:154, although Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (London: Penguin, 1997), 530, has noted that 4Q372 1 14, 21 defines the southern tribes as Levi, Judah, and Benjamin, a configuration only found in 1QM I 2.

<sup>12</sup> Schuller, “4Q372 1: A Text About Joseph,” 376.

<sup>13</sup> Schuller, “4Q372 1: A Text About Joseph,” 376 (italics mine). This relegation of the importance of Joseph’s exile has trickled down into Martin G. Abegg’s study of the theme of exile in the Qumran literature, “Exile and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions* (ed. James M. Scott; JSJSup 56; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 111–26 at 117: “although exilic language abounds” in 4Q372 1, “the exile itself is subordinate to the Samaritan problem.” Abegg, “Exile,” 117, concludes: “The focus on the text, however, does not appear to be the fate of the Joseph tribes as much as the status of the peoples who dwelt in their place.”

evidenced by the occurrences of קנא, גבל, and כעס, the Song of Moses (Deut 32) has had a strong influence on the text.<sup>14</sup> In the Song of Moses, God states: הם קנאוני בלא אל כעסוני בהבליהם ואני אקניאם בלא עם בגוי נבל אכעיסם (“They made me jealous with what is no god, they angered me with idols. So I will make them jealous with a no-people, with a foolish nation I will anger them”) (Deut 32:21). This prophecy comes to fruition in 4Q372 1 10–14 when a foolish people (גבלים) builds a במה on a high mountain and incites Israel to jealousy (להקניא) and angers (להכעיס) the sons of Levi, Judah, and Benjamin through its words.

Nonetheless, there is another biblical text that, in concert with Deuteronomy 32, has apparently wielded influence over 4Q372 1, providing a compelling explanation as to why the author refers to the northern tribes as “Joseph.” Since the verbs כעס and קנא are only found together in the Song of Moses (Deut 32:16, 21) and in Ps 78:58, the informed reader would have read 4Q372 1 not only in light of Deut 32, but also in light of Ps 78.<sup>15</sup> To be sure, the echo of Deut 32:21 is heard most loudly in 4Q372 1 since the prophecy that God would make his people jealous and angry through a foolish people (ואני אקניאם בלא עם בגוי נבל אכעיסם) finds direct fulfillment in 4Q372 1’s claim that a foolish people (גבלים) was making Israel jealous (להקניא) and angering (להכעיס) Levi, Judah, and Benjamin (lines 11–14). Yet, the informed reader would know that God’s punishment was the result of Israel’s rebellion. Just as his people had made him jealous and angry (הם קנאוני בלא אל כעסוני בהבליהם), so God responds, tit-for-tat, by making them jealous and angry (Deut 32:21; cf. 32:16). As noted above, Ps 78:58 contains a parallel to this in its claim that Israel provoked God to jealousy and anger (ויכעיסוהו במותם ויבפסיליהם יקניאוהו), a parallel the author of *4QNarrative and Poetic*

<sup>14</sup> Schuller, “4Q372 1: A Text about Joseph,” 371; *DJD* 28:174, notes this influence, as does Elisha Qimron, “Observations on the Reading of ‘A Text about Joseph’ (4Q372, 1),” *RevQ* 15/60 (1992): 603–4 at 603.

<sup>15</sup> For the relationship between Ps 78 and Deut 32, see Otto Eissfeldt, *Das Lied Moses, Deuteronomium 32:1–43 und Das Lehrgedicht Asaphs Psalm 78: samt einer Analyse der Umgebung des Mose-Liedes* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1958). For the broader relationship between Ps 78 and deuteronomistic thinking, see Hubert Junker, “Die Entstehungszeit des Ps 78 und des Deuteronomiums,” *Bib* 34 (1953): 487–500, although his argument that the psalmist was active in the reform of Josiah is dubious.

*Composition* was apparently cognizant of and to which he intended to allude. This is supported by the fact that the tit-for-tat punishment of Deut 32:21 is furthered in 4Q372 1 by the reference to the במה of the foolish people: in response to the rebellious actions of Israel, characterized in Ps 78:58 by the setting up of במות and the use of פסילים, God punishes Israel, not merely by provoking it to jealousy (להקניא) and anger (להכעיס) through a foolish nation (נבלים), but specifically through this foolish nation's own במה and through its words. That is to say, in 4Q372 1, Israel's punishment closely parallels its rebellion according to Ps 78:58.<sup>16</sup> While Deut 32:16 states that God was provoked to anger and jealousy by his people's worship of strange gods and idols, Ps 78:58 specifically links this provocation to the establishment of במות. It is thus fitting that the foolish people of 4Q372 1 through their own establishment of a במה provoke God's rebellious people to anger and jealousy. 4Q372 1 makes part of the punishment of God's people correspond closely to the rebellion that they were guilty of themselves, depicted in Ps 78, that is, the building and use of במות.<sup>17</sup>

In light of the evident influence that Ps 78 has had on our fragment, it is of interest that this psalm provides one of the relatively few biblical instances of referring to the northern tribes by the titular "Joseph" (see n. 7 above). It seems probable that, given the allusions to Ps 78 within the fragment, 4Q372's use of "Joseph" for the northern tribes derives also from the psalm and might in fact be a response to Joseph's portrayal found therein. It is therefore necessary to examine Ps 78 in order to determine what the intention of the author of *4QNarrative and Poetic Composition* is.

<sup>16</sup> Given the parallels between Ps 78:58 and 4Q372 1, it is tempting to agree with Schuller and Bernstein's reconstruction of line 3 as "and they honoured those who make [idols]" (וכבדו את עבדין הפסל) since this would make the rebellion of 4Q372 1 similar to that found in Ps 78:58: "and they made him jealous with their idols" (ובפסיליהם יקניאוהו).

<sup>17</sup> The other part of their punishment, according to 4Q372 1 12–14, consists in enduring the horrifying words and blaspheming of this foolish people.

## Psalm 78 and the Fate of Joseph

As the commentaries repeatedly mention, Ps 78 appears to be a bit of an oddity within the Psalter.<sup>18</sup> Issues of form and provenance are contested and seemingly without resolution. Some argue that the psalm is clearly pre-exilic since it does not mention the fall of the southern kingdom or destruction of the Temple in 586 B.C.E.<sup>19</sup> Others believe this argument from silence to be unpersuasive and argue for a post-exilic date.<sup>20</sup> Among those opting for a post-exilic date, some believe the psalm was originally intended as a diatribe against the Samaritan establishment in the north: “If a post-exilic setting is posited for the psalm then the actual point of Israel’s rejection becomes less important than the polemics of the nascent Jewish community directed against the long established Samaritan community.”<sup>21</sup> If this is the case, then the connections between 4Q372 1 and Ps 78 become even more apparent for both are clearly critical of the Samaritans. Nonetheless, even if the psalm was a pre-exilic composition of southern provenance originally intended as polemic against the northern tribes, it might have been used as anti-Samaritan propaganda in the post-exilic period.<sup>22</sup> As Robert P. Carroll suggests: “its function after the exile must have contributed greatly to the polemic directed against the Samaritan

<sup>18</sup> For instance, Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (trans. Hilton C. Oswald; CC; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 122: “Psalm 78 is in many respects a unique piece in the OT.”

<sup>19</sup> Eissfeldt, *Das Lied Moses*, and Antony F. Campbell, “Psalm 78: A Contribution to the Theology of Tenth Century Israel,” *CBQ* 41 (1979): 51–79, argue for a tenth-c. dating; Mitchell Dahood, *Psalms II* (AB 17; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1968), 238, argues for a dating between 922–721 B.C.E.; Michael D. Goulder, *The Psalms of Asaph and the Pentateuch: Studies in the Psalter III* (JSOTSup 233; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 110, suggests that it is a response to the Assyrian crisis in 722 B.C.E.

<sup>20</sup> Hermann Gunkel, *Die Psalmen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968), 342; Kraus, *Psalms 60–150*, 124.

<sup>21</sup> Robert P. Carroll, “Psalm LXXVIII: Vestiges of a Tribal Polemic,” *VT* 21 (1971): 133–50 at 146. See also, Kraus, *Psalms 60–150*, 131.

<sup>22</sup> Goulder, *Psalms of Asaph*, 126, suggests that, already prior to 586 B.C.E., the psalm was used differently than originally intended. This adaptation of the psalm to suit different situations is something that should be expected of liturgical works.

community. In that period, the ancient traditions of the past had been reshaped to form the theologoumena of early Judaism.”<sup>23</sup> For the purpose of this paper, therefore, it is not necessary to determine whether the psalm is pre- or post-exilic, since, regardless of its original purpose, the psalm could have been used against the Samaritans in the Hasmonean and Herodian periods.

If it is the case that Ps 78 was resourced as a weapon against Samaritan claims, it is important to note exactly what is said of the northern kingdom in the final verses of the psalm (78:56–72). After reciting the history of God’s gracious dealings with his people (cf. Deut 32:6–14), the psalmist claims that the tribes of Israel “tested and rebelled against God Most High, and his testimonies they did not observe, but they turned away and acted treacherously like their fathers; they twisted like a deceitful bow. For they provoked him to anger with their high places; they moved him to jealousy with their graven images” (Ps 78:56–58). As a result of this rebellion God completely rejected Israel: **וימאס מאד בישראל**.<sup>24</sup> Psalm 78:60–64 envisions both God’s rejection of Israel and its subsequent military defeat as punishment for its sins, fitting the deuteronomic scheme of Sin-Exile-Restoration. In this, Ps 78:60–64 parallels Deut 32:22–26. Finally, Ps 78:65–66 apparently describes God’s action on behalf of his people: “Then the Lord awoke as from sleep, like a mighty man who is overcome by wine. And he put his adversaries to rout, he put them to eternal shame.” Much like Deut 32:35–43, Ps 78 portrays God acting on behalf of the people he had punished, putting those who punished them to shame. Yet, Ps 78 contains a twist not found in the deuteronomic historical scheme in that Israel (also referred to as Ephraim and Joseph) *remained* rejected even after God punished his enemies: “but he [God] rejected the tent of Joseph, and the tribe of Ephraim he did not choose. And he chose the tribe of Judah, the mountain of Zion he loved. And he built his sanctuary as the heights, as the

<sup>23</sup> Carroll, “Psalm LXXVIII,” 147.

<sup>24</sup> If the reference to Ephraim in 78:9 is original, as argued by Campbell, “Psalm 78,” then the sins of the north have been accumulating for a lengthy period. While Kraus, *Psalms 60–150*, believes this to be a scribal gloss, 11QPs<sup>d</sup>, a ms dated to the first c. C.E., does mention the Ephraimites, so it is possible that it is an early gloss that was known to the author and readers of 4Q372. Cf. Florentino García Martínez et al., *DJD* 23:72–73; Frank A. Gosling, “Were the Ephraimites to Blame?” [VT](#) 49 (1999): 505–13.



earth, which he established forever. And he chose David, his servant, and he took him from the sheepfolds” (Ps 78:67–70).<sup>25</sup>

The history recapitulated in Ps 78 ends with the rejection of Israel and subsequent favoring of the southern kingdom of Judah. What the author originally intended by the language of rejection (מאַס, cf. 78:59, 67) is debated by scholars;<sup>26</sup> nonetheless, it is possible that some who heard Ps 78 recited liturgically might conclude that the fate of the northern kingdoms was unimportant. The southern kingdom, with its Temple cult in Jerusalem and Davidic monarchy, superseded and replaced the northern kingdom. Despite the efforts of scholars to mitigate the language of rejection by relating it only to the cult at Shiloh or the kingship of the northern tribes,<sup>27</sup> the emphatic nature of the rejection (וַיִּמְאַס מְאֹד)—the only time in the MT where מְאֹד is used in conjunction with the verb (מַאֲס) points towards the possibility of the total rejection of the northern tribes. As Marvin E. Tate notes: “Once Yahweh had rejected it, it ceased to exist in any meaningful sense.”<sup>28</sup> In other words, “The Northern Kingdom, with its cult and its statehood, is definitively eliminated from the history of God’s guidance.”<sup>29</sup> For the psalmist, the fate of Joseph was one of unending rejection: no restoration of the northern tribes was anticipated.

<sup>25</sup> In fact, it is possible that God’s annihilation of his enemies and the rejection of Joseph are one and the same thing. Cf. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150*, 130.

<sup>26</sup> See, for instance, Carroll, “Psalm LXXVIII: Vestiges of a Tribal Polemic,” Kraus, *Psalms 60–150*, 118–31; Craig C. Broyles, *Psalms* (NIBC 13; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999), 319–26.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Melody D. Knowles, “The Flexible Rhetoric of Retelling: The Choice of David in the Texts of the Psalms,” *CBQ* 67 (2005): 236–49 at 241–43; Richard J. Clifford, “In Zion and David a New Beginning: An Interpretation of Psalm 78,” in *Traditions in Transformation: Turning Points in Biblical Faith* (ed. Baruch Halpern and Jon D. Levenson; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1981), 121–41: “The northern tribes *per se* are not rejected” (132); Broyles, *Psalms*, 319–26.

<sup>28</sup> Marvin E. Tate, *Psalms 51–100* (WBC 20; Dallas: Word Books, 1990), 286. So too, Frank-Lothar Hossfeld and Erich Zenger, *Psalms 2: A Commentary on Psalms 51–100* (trans. L. M. Maloney; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 291.

<sup>29</sup> Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalms 2*, 301.

### 4Q372 and Joseph's Exile

Given the Samaritan claim to being descendants of Joseph, Ps 78 could have been leveraged as one of the prime pieces of evidence against the legitimacy of the Samaritan cult located at Mount Gerizim. It would have been difficult to contest the Samaritan claim to be descendants of Joseph since in the post-exilic period it was difficult to prove or disprove ancestry. Instead, it might have served the purposes of some to associate the Samaritans with the tribes of Joseph only to then point out that, according to Ps 78, God had rejected them. That is to say, although the Samaritans claimed to be descended from Joseph this did not legitimate them, since, according to Ps 78, God utterly rejected Joseph and replaced him with Judah. It may have been the claim of many in the south that God was only concerned with Judah and had forsaken the northern tribes, known as Joseph, entirely.<sup>30</sup>

If those in the south, perhaps associated with the Jerusalem cult, used Ps 78 for such a purpose, it is possible to read 4Q372 1 in a new light. While the above comments are entirely compatible with seeing allusions to the Samaritans within 4Q372 1, as Schuller has argued, the author has another matter in mind: demonstrating to his readers that they are to be concerned with the fate of “Joseph.” The author reveals his own concern for the northern tribes in the double occurrence of the phrase “in all this Joseph” (בבול זה יוסף) (lines 10, 14) which forms an *inclusio* around the current position that Levi, Judah, and Benjamin find themselves in.<sup>31</sup> Thus, we now turn to an examination of 4Q372 1's retelling of Israel's history with an eye to how it relates to the histories previously told in both Deut 32 and Ps 78. As will be seen, all three follow a deuteronomic scheme of Sin-Exile-Restoration—where 4Q372 1 deviates from this will be of significance for our discussion.

Although the text is not well preserved, there is enough evidence to suggest that sin (whether that of Israel, Judah, or both is uncertain) constitutes the theme of line 3 of 4Q372 1.<sup>32</sup> Schuller has proposed the reading זרים

<sup>30</sup> A separation of the respective fates of the northern and southern kingdoms might also be envisioned in Zech 11:14: “Then I broke my staff ‘Union,’ breaking the brotherhood of the sons of Judah and the sons of Israel.”

<sup>31</sup> Schuller, “4Q372 1: A Text About Joseph,” 367, says that בבול זה יוסף functions almost formulaically.

<sup>32</sup> In this, 4Q372 1 1–3 parallels Deut 32:15–18 and Ps 78:9–58.

(“strangers/strange gods”) but notes that it is highly uncertain since the first letter could be a *yod* or *waw*, the third letter seems too wide for a *yod*, and the final letter too short for a final *mem*.<sup>33</sup> Line 3 refers to כמרים (“priests”), and although the line provides little context for understanding who the כמרים are, the likelihood that these priests were idolatrous or foreign is demonstrated by its three biblical occurrences: King Josiah deposed the כמרים who burnt incense on the high places (במות) to Baal, the sun, the moon, the stars, and all the host of heaven (2 Kgs 23:5); the prophet Hosea condemned the northern kingdom of Israel, claiming that the כמרים would mourn for the calf of Beth-aven (Hos 10:5); the prophet Zephaniah stated that God would cut off from Jerusalem the remnant of Baal and the name of the כמרים who, while they bowed down to YHWH, also bowed down to the host of heaven and to Milcom (Zeph 1:4–5). In light of these passages, it is likely that 4Q372 1 is referring to idolatrous priests in Israel or Judah. Since two of the three condemnations of כמרים also mention במות (i.e. 2 Kgs 23:5; Hos 10:8), it is possible that the work originally contained a reference to במות, thereby providing explicit correspondence between the people’s sin and God’s punishment of making them jealous by the same means.<sup>34</sup> Even if the work did not originally contain the word, readers would have associated כמרים with במות. Whatever the exact contents of lines 1–3 may have been, it makes sense to see them as the cause behind God’s action in line 4: “The Most High gave them into the hand of the nations.” This phrase corresponds exactly to Ps 106:41: “he [God] gave them into the hand of the nations, so that those who hated them ruled over them.”<sup>35</sup> As Schuller notes, this is standard biblical terminology for exile.<sup>36</sup> That this is the meaning here is confirmed in lines 5–6 where the author states that into all the lands and into all nations he scattered them<sup>37</sup> and he annihilated them from the land. The theme is clearly deuteronomic—God removed Israel from the land as a

<sup>33</sup> Schuller and Bernstein, *DJD* 28:168. If their reconstruction is correct, this may be a possible allusion to Deut 32:16, in which it is said: יקנאהו בזרים בחוועבת יכעיסהו.

<sup>34</sup> See the discussion of במות above.

<sup>35</sup> For similar passages, see Ezek 39:23. While Ezek 31:11 refers to Egypt, the same phrasing is found there.

<sup>36</sup> Schuller, “4Q372 1: A Text About Joseph,” 172.

<sup>37</sup> This is supplied from 4Q371 1a–b 1 which overlaps with 4Q372 1 5.

result of their rebellion and unfaithfulness.<sup>38</sup> God's action of scattering Israel and eliminating it from the land is linked by the author to the actions of the nations in the valley of Vision (גי החזון), a term that is appropriated from Isaiah (cf. Isa 22:1, 5) in order for the author to link his narrative to biblical threats of punishment by exile. Although the text is fragmentary at this point (4Q372 1 8 reads: ]ירושלים לעיים ואת הר אלהי לבמות יען and 4Q371 1a–b 5 reads only: (אלוהי לבמות]ת), this is sufficiently similar to Mic 3:12 to suggest that the line originally read as follows: ציון שדה תחרש ירושלים לעיים ואת הר אלהי לבמות יער.<sup>39</sup> Thus, 4Q372 1 4–8 presents God's punishment for the sins of his people.<sup>40</sup>

According to Schuller, 4Q372 1 8b–10a describes the restoration of the southern tribes, although she acknowledges that “these lines (and particularly the reference to the crossroads) are the least easily explained in this interpretation of the whole section.”<sup>41</sup> Given the extremely fragmentary nature of the text at this point, it is difficult to ascertain even the basic content of these few lines.<sup>42</sup> It does indeed appear that Levi, Judah, and Benjamin have returned to the land and thus their exile has seemingly come to an end. Yet, for those who knew Deut 32, the retelling of Israel's history hints that things are not as they should be.<sup>43</sup> According to the Song

<sup>38</sup> Cf. for instance, Deut 29.

<sup>39</sup> The only difference between 4Q371–372 and Mic 3:12 is that Micah reads הַבַּיִת whereas 4Q371–2 reads אֱלֹהֵי. In Jer 26:18, the elders of the land cite Mic 3:12.

<sup>40</sup> Again, 4Q372 1 4–8 parallels Deut 32:19–25 and Ps 78:59–64.

<sup>41</sup> Schuller, “4Q372 1: A Text about Joseph,” 359.

<sup>42</sup> Michael A. Knibb, “A Note on 4Q372 and 4Q390,” in *The Scriptures and the Scrolls: Studies in Honour of A. S. van der Woude on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (ed. Florentino García Martínez et al.; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 164–70 at 167: “the treatment of the Return (lines 8b–10a) remains enigmatic, partly because of the damage the text has suffered, and partly because the meaning of what has survived is not immediately obvious.”

<sup>43</sup> Matthew Thiessen, “The Form and Function of the Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32:1–43),” *JBL* 123 (2004): 401–24, has argued that Deut 32 was composed for and used in Israel's liturgy and was therefore of signal importance in the formation of the nation's historical self-awareness. Patrick Skehan and Eugene Ulrich, “4QDeut<sup>a</sup>,” *DJD* 14:137, and Skehan, “A Fragment of the ‘Song of Moses’ (Deut 32) from Qumran,” *BASOR* 136 (1954): 12–15, have argued that 4QDeut<sup>a</sup> only contained the Song of Moses and was a special use scroll, likely used within a liturgical context. Josephus states that Moses “recited to them a poem in

of Moses, Israel's sin would lead to God's punishment and part of this punishment would be, as noted above, that God would make them jealous (קנא) with a "non-people" and would anger (כעס) them with a foolish nation (גוי נבל) (Deut 32:21). This is exactly what 4Q372 1 envisions as the situation, despite the fact that Levi, Judah, and Benjamin have been restored to the land. Foolish people (גבלים) are currently in the land and are provoking Israel's jealousy (קנא) through a במה, as well as provoking Levi, Judah, and Benjamin's anger (כעס) through their words. According to Deut 32, Israel's history remained in the period of exile as long as there continued to be a foolish people who provoke it to jealousy and anger. And, as Schuller has compellingly argued, according to 4Q372 1, the Samaritans are the foolish people prophesied about in the Song of Moses. The author seems to portray the Samaritans, with their במה on a high mountain (probably Gerizim as Schuller argues), as the foolish people of Deut 32:21 who provoke God's people to jealousy and anger (קנא and כעס); but, according to the Song of Moses, God would avenge the blood of his servants, punish his enemies, and cleanse his people's land (cf. Deut 32:43).<sup>44</sup> This is not the situation envisioned in the narrative of

---

hexameter verse, which he has moreover bequeathed in a book preserved in the temple, containing a prediction of future events" (*Ant.* 4.303). That this poem is the Song of Moses is clear from the references to the blessings and curses that preceded the Song in the book of Deuteronomy (*Ant.* 4.302). Cf. H. St. J. Thackeray, *Josephus: The Man and the Historian* (New York: Ktav, 1967), 90–91. Thackeray argues that the phrase "in hexameter rhythm" suggests use by a temple choir. This evidence suggests that the Song was used liturgically in the Second Temple period and would have been well known, and thus highly influential, to large segments of the Jewish population at the time that *4QNarrative and Poetic Composition* was composed.

<sup>44</sup> There are three different readings of this verse as preserved in the MT, LXX, and 4QDeut<sup>a</sup>, all of which contain reference to these actions of God. Cf. Arie van der Kooij, "The Ending of the Song of Moses: On the Pre-Masoretic Version of Deut 32:43," in *Studies in Deuteronomy in Honour of C. J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (ed. Florentino García Martínez et al.; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 94–100. Interestingly, *Sifre Deut.* 331 comments on v. 43, in particular, the phrase *שיב לצריו* ונקם, stating, "This refers to the Samaritans, as it is said, 'Now when the adversaries of Judah and Benjamin heard.'" Even at a later date, therefore, there was a Jewish tradition that associated the Samaritans with the enemies, and perhaps foolish people (although the *Sifre* does not explicitly say so), of the Song of Moses.

4Q372 1. Therefore, if the Samaritans still reside in the land and provoke God's people to jealousy and anger, the exile remains a continuing reality and God's punishment has not ceased. The Samaritans then are an indicator that not all is right: the restoration of Levi, Judah, and Benjamin does not indicate that God's punishment of exile has ended. Through the interpretation of the foolish people as the Samaritans, the author has re-narrated himself and his readers into the exilic period of Deut 32's historical scheme.

This observation clearly places 4Q372 1 within a trend in the literature of Second Temple Judaism noted by Odil H. Steck.<sup>45</sup> Steck argued that the theme of the continuing exile of Israel and the expectation for Israel's full restoration are common in the literature of this period, a claim which has been further substantiated by more recent scholarship.<sup>46</sup> Many Jews, under Greek or Roman rule, believed that their current situation fell short of the promise of a restoration such as Deutero-Isaiah envisions. Although many believed that they remained in exile, this was joined with the hope that God would restore glory to his people. This analysis of the current situation and the related hope of restoration was shared by the author of *4QNarrative and Poetic Composition*. And as long as the Samaritans remained in the land as a provocation to God's people, restoration remained in the future.

Michael A. Knibb has also argued that 4Q372 1 fits this general pattern, yet differs from it in one particular way: whereas most of these works are concerned with the restoration of the southern kingdom and Jerusalem, 4Q372 1 is concerned with the fate of the northern kingdom.<sup>47</sup> Twice

<sup>45</sup> Odil H. Steck, *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum* (WMANT 23; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner, 1967). See also, Peter R. Ackroyd, *Exile and Restoration: A Study of Hebrew Thought of the Sixth Century B.C.* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968), 237–47.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Michael A. Knibb, "The Exile in the Literature of the Intertestamental Period," *HeyJ* 17 (1976): 253–79; N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 268–72; James M. Scott, ed., *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish and Christian Conceptions* (JSJSup 56; Leiden: Brill, 1997); idem, *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives* (JSJSup 72; Leiden: Brill, 2001); Craig A. Evans, "Jesus and the Continuing Exile of Israel," in *Jesus and the Restoration of Israel* (ed. Carey C. Newman; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1999), 77–100.

<sup>47</sup> Knibb, "A Note on 4Q372 and 4Q390," 169. Knibb notes that the only other work that refers to the northern kingdom is *As. Mos.* 3:4–4:9. Cf. Daniel R. Schwartz, "The Tribes of *As. Mos.* 4:7–9," *JBL* 99 (1980): 217–23.

within 4Q372 1 the author states **וּבְכָל זֶה יוֹסֵף** (“in all this Joseph”) was hurled into lands he did not know/given into the hands of the sons of foreigners (4Q372 1 10, 14). The difference Knibb finds between 4Q372 1 and the majority of other texts concerned with the continuing exile of God’s people is illustrative of the work’s larger purpose. By specifically highlighting Joseph’s continuing state of exile in, what Schuller calls, “almost formulaic fashion,” through the repeated phrase **וּבְכָל זֶה יוֹסֵף**, the author again confirms that all is not right. Those amongst the tribes of Levi, Judah, and Benjamin who believed (along with Ps 78) that the tribes of Joseph were entirely removed from God’s care and provision were mistaken. Since the Samaritans, the foolish people of Deut 32, were still in the land and in all this Joseph was still in foreign lands, whatever degree of restoration the southern tribes believed themselves to be experiencing had to be severely qualified by Joseph’s continuing exile. It is at the point when Joseph cries out to God that the narrational section of 4Q372 1 ends and the poetic section of the fragment begins. It is of course uncertain, given its fragmentary nature, whether the work originally recounted Joseph’s restoration after his prayer, but the repentance suggested by Joseph’s allusion to Ps 51:15–16 in lines 27–28, as well as the fact that repentance precedes restoration in the deuteronomic cycle of history, suggests that the work originally contained a depiction of this restoration.<sup>48</sup>

## Conclusion

Schuller has rightly noted the presence of Samaritans in 4Q372 1. They are most likely the historical identity behind the foolish people who build a **בְּמָה** on a high mountain and provoke Israel’s jealousy and anger. Yet, to conclude from this that 4Q372 1 should be defined as an anti-Samaritan

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Eileen M. Schuller, “The Psalm of 4Q372 1 Within the Context of Second Temple Prayer,” *CBQ* 54 (1992): 67–79 at 72. Although this paper has focused on the deuteronomic cycle within the fragment and thus has discussed only the narrational section of 4Q372 1, Schuller’s study of the poetic section demonstrates that this portion of the fragment is in line with the above interpretation of the entire fragment. Further, Schuller’s treatment of the poetic section, “Psalm,” 71, supports the conclusion that the prayer envisions restoration in lines 22–23 through the prayer, as evidenced by the “statement of confidence in the destruction of the enemy and personal restoration.”

fragment is possibly misleading in that, as noted above, it relegates the issue of the northern tribes' continuing exile to a secondary status. If my understanding of the importance of Ps 78 for the fragment is correct, this relative importance needs to be inverted. It is not so much the Samaritans themselves that are the issue, but rather the fate of the tribes of Joseph. To be sure, the Samaritans are not unimportant, but their importance is that their presence in the land as the embodiment of the foolish people of Deut 32:21 indicates that Israel remains in the period of exile within the deuteronomic pattern of Sin-Exile-Restoration. The Samaritans function as a reminder to the southern tribes (Levi, Judah, and Benjamin) that, while they might be tempted to conclude that the exile is over, Israel (Joseph) still endures God's punishment. Restoration has not been achieved: Joseph is still in foreign lands. Whatever polemic might be found in this fragment is not directed against the Samaritans at Mount Gerizim, but against those in the south who espoused a theology, perhaps dependent upon Ps 78 where God is said to utterly reject Joseph, that claimed that the fate of the descendants of Joseph was unrelated to the fate of Levi, Judah, and Benjamin. 4Q372 1, with the help of Deut 32, demonstrates that Ps 78 cannot be read as God's utter rejection of the northern tribes. While they remain in exile, full restoration is yet to come, even for those currently in the land. Through such means, the author attempts to convince his readers that the southern tribes' fate remains bound to the fate of the northern tribes. By doing so, the author encourages his readers, signified by Levi, Judah, and Benjamin, to call out to God, in the words of Joseph: "My Father and my God, do not forsake me in the hand of the nations. Render justice for me" (4Q372 1 16–17a).<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> Although Kugler, "Joseph," 275, suggests that Qumranites who used this text would have understood themselves to be both groups, the clear distinction between the tribes of Levi, Judah, and Benjamin, which are in the land, and the tribe of Joseph, which is not in the land, militates against this suggestion. Nonetheless, Kugler, "Joseph," 275, helpfully notes that this text could be appropriated by the Qumranites in response to their belief that they were experiencing exile. Such usage is in continuity with 4Q372 1's goal of demonstrating to those in the land the ambiguity of their existence whilst Joseph remains in exile.