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“SEPARATE YOURSELF FROM THE GENTILES” 
(*JUBILEES 22:16): INTERMARRIAGE IN THE BOOK OF JUBILEES*

Christian Frevel

1. The Book of Jubilees as Part of Early Hellenistic Discourse: 
   Introduction

In early Hellenistic Judaism the refusal of mixed marriages was widespread. Its impact has an anti-Hellenistic direction and aims at the development of a distinct Jewish religious identity. Therefore, it is referred to authoritative literature in this context, as Armin Lange has pointed out correctly.1 The same holds true for the book of Jubilees, especially for ch. 30. Jubilees reveals an anti-Hellenistic attitude, be it extro- or introverted,2 which is quite prominent because of its radicalism and the recourse to the biblical texts. Within the Hellenistic discourse on Jewish identity, the book of Jubilees advocates a clear-cut demarcation between Jews and the Gentiles.3 There is hardly any Jewish writing from the second century B.C.E. that is as radical and plain in the call for separation from the nations as the book of Jubilees, which dates from the

* An earlier version of this study was presented to the ProPent-Meeting 2009 at Bass Lake (Pretoria). I thank Dirk Human, Jurie le Roux, Eckart Otto and the other participants for helpful comments.


middle of the second century B.C.E. As in most biblical texts, the concept is explicated by a narrative whose plot is a specific re-narration of the biblical account, which forms the frame; *Jubilees* can be addressed as a sort of narrative halakhic Midrash. Thus the narrative can be applied to the early Hellenistic discourse in Jewish identity. Within the book of *Jubilees* the binary opposition between Jews and Gentiles was constructed and employed in different ways, producing either permeable or impermeable boundaries between the Hellenistic or Hellenized world and the ideally constructed Israel, which may be in fact restricted to Jerusalem.

The concept of separation by the prohibition of mixed marriage promoted by Second Temple texts has manifold biblical roots. One quite significant reference is Deut 7:3: “You shall not intermarry with them: do not give your daughters their sons or take their daughters for your sons!” Like Deut 7:3, many biblical texts attest that this multifaceted discourse on a religious “Jewish” identity is, with regard to the texts, closely linked to the problematic of sexual contacts resp. mixed marriages. The rejection of interethnic marriages as unfolded in the book of *Jubilees* (*Jub.* 20:4–6; 22:20–22; 25:3–10; 27:8–10; 30:7–17; 34:20–21; 35:14 etc.) is an important part of this concept, referring to, correcting and intensifying biblical traditions (Gen 24; 26:34–35; 27:46–28:9; 34; 36; 38; Exod 34:15–16; Lev 21:7, 9; Num 25:6–13; Deut 7:1–5; Ezra 9:2, 12, 14; 10:10–11; Neh 13:27; Mal 2:10–16 etc.). Thus the book of *Jubilees* can be placed in the multifaceted discourse on the acceptance and rejection of intermarriages in the (early) Hellenistic period, also represented by Esther, Tobit, the Book of the Words of Noah (1Q20), the Book of (the)...
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Watchers (4Q201–206, 1 Hen. 6–11), the Testament of Levi (T. Levi 6), the Aramaic Levi Document (4Q213–215; 1Q21; CLevBodl.Cam, Koutloumasiou 39), the Temple Scroll (4Q524; 11Q19–21) and several other texts. The book of Jubilees offers an anti-Hellenistic bias similar to that which arose in proto-Sadducean Levitical priestly circles.

The present study deals with these discourses on mixed marriages in the book of Jubilees by focusing on the reception of the Dinah account in Jub. 30, which is the paramount narrative paradigm regarding the rejection of intermarriage with the Gentiles in post-biblical times. This rejection is based on the purity–impurity paradigm as any sexual contacts with foreigners are considered defiling. The discussion of purity in Jubilees will play a background role in this essay, but I will not give special attention to that topic.

14. Regarding the purity paradigm which encompasses physical, ritual, moral and genealogical aspects, see Jonathan Klawans, Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006); Klawans, Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism (Oxford:
With regard to intermarriages Gen 34 has to be considered a nodal point: on the one hand, it reflects the post-exilic/pre-Hellenistic debate on circumcision, conversion and intermarriages with its numerous and varied positions. By taking up, discussing, interpreting, “correcting” and tightening several biblical traditions including the topic of “intermarriage” as well as the identity, resp. boundary-marker “circumcision,” Gen 34 constitutes an “endpoint” resp. a highlight of an inner-biblical development concerning the attitude(s) towards mixed marriages and boundary maintenance. On the other hand Gen 34 has to be considered a starting point regarding the history of reception. Therefore it provides a concept for the refusal of mixed marriages, which is frequently referred to in Hellenistic times (e.g. Jubilees, the Testament of Levi, the Aramaic Levi Document etc.) in order to justify a general prohibition of any sexual contact with Gentiles resp. of mixed marriages. Because Jub. 30 provides one of the most popular and explicit recourses to Gen 34, my remarks will concentrate on this narrative and the line of reception in Jubilees. Thus my essay will highlight the discussion as well as the development concerning the assessment of intermarriage from the Persian to the Hellenistic period. Nevertheless, I will start my investigation with a brief look at the Abraham chapters in Jub. 20–22, chapters in which the basics of separation are developed and some benchmarks of the topic of Jub. 30 are already established. Then, after some short introductory remarks on Gen 34, I will focus firstly on the different positions regarding intermarriages and the finally predominant one in


Gen 34. Second, I will look at the reception of Gen 34 in Jub. 30 or, to put it differently, the question of how Jub. 30 refers to Gen 34 and what significant modifications can be found there. It will become apparent that Jub. 30 provides a general ban on intermarriages which in its rationales and explicitness is far beyond the scope of Gen 34 and has a decidedly anti-Hellenistic attitude. Since it is quite interesting that this general prohibition is not founded in the first instance by referring to the explicit prohibitions of Exod 34:12–16 or Deut 7:1–5, but by the recourse to the “Molech passage” in Lev 20:2–5, I will finally propose an explanation for this linkage by taking the Hellenistic “context” and the anti-Hellenistic “scope” of Jub. 30 into consideration.

2. Fornication and Defilement:
Setting the Agenda in the Abraham Narrative

Within Jubilees’ Abraham narrative the issue is raised for the first time in an explicit mode: when Abraham, who is “recorded a friend of the Lord in the heavenly tablets” (Jub. 19:9), became old and expected his imminent death, three ultimate admonitions are introduced which are all inspired by Gen 24:3–4 and which put increasing importance on the separation from the nations. The first and last one address the topic of interethnic marriages explicitly, and the final testimony to Jacob alludes in some way to the story of Dinah in Jub. 30:

(1) In Jub. 20 Abraham gathers his sons and grandsons and demands all his male offspring to guard the way of the Lord (Jub. 20:2) by committing to justice and righteousness, performing circumcision and keeping from all fornication and pollution. This is underlined by a general law uttered in direct speech (Jub. 20:4): “If any woman or girl among you commits a sexual offense, burn her in fire.”16 This general law, which in this form is not attested in the biblical commandments, is a productive interpretation of several biblical pre-texts (Deut 22:23–24; Lev 19:29; 21:9; Num 5:11–31, and Gen 38:24). Especially noteworthy is the sanction to burn the delinquent with fire, instead of a stoning sentence (Deut 22:21, 24). Burning is rare in the Torah: one may be referred to Lev 20:14 where an intra-familial marriage with mother and daughter is

16. Translation by James C. VanderKam, The Book of Jubilees: Translation (CSCO 511 / Scriptores Aethiopici 88; Leuven: Peeters, 1989), but see Orval S. Witherington, “Jubilees (Second Century B.C.),” OTP 2:35–142 (93): “And when any woman or girl fornicates among you, you will burn her with fire.” Unless otherwise noted, all quotations from Jubilees are by VanderKam.
prohibited and all persons concerned shall be burnt because of the severity of the issue (נאה נוראר). Although Jub. 41:25–26, Jubilees’ Tamar account, takes up Lev 20:14, and Jub. 41:28 refers back to the law of Abraham in Jub. 20:4, the special matter seems a bit far away from the more general Jub. 20:4. Leviticus 21:9 appears to be rather close instead: “When the daughter of a priest profanes herself through prostitution (נוה נוראר), she profanes her father; she shall be burned to death (נאה נוראר).”\textsuperscript{17} If one assumes that Jubilees expands the specific laws regarding the priestly caste on the whole society (as it is the case with regard to mixed marriage), the burning in Jub. 21:4 may be related to Lev 21:9 (see below). The second close parallel is Tamar (in Gen 38:24) who shall be burned (נורה נוראר) because of public fornication (נאה נוראר).\textsuperscript{18} The Tamar account in Jubilees adds the category of pollution: “Bring her out and let her be burned because she has done something impure in Israel” (Jub. 41:17). Especially noteworthy is the combination of stoning and burning in the Dinah narrative in Jub. 30:7. While the man who gives his daughter or sister to the Gentiles shall be stoned, the daughter or sister shall be burned. Because mixed marriages are evaluated as fornication and defilement, the sentence of Jub. 20:4 is applied. In the same way adultery defiles, interethnic marriages make unclean. This will become clear in looking at Jub. 30 below. With “fornication” and “defilement,” Jub. 20:4 introduces key words of the mixed marriage discourse which hint at the Tamar story in Jub. 41 as well as at the Dinah story in Jub. 30. The act of fornication oscillates between adultery and idolatry, which becomes clear in the continuation of the passage. The children of Abraham must not commit idolatry and go after their idols and after their uncleanness (Jub. 20:7). The first textual reference of “their” is Sodom and Gomorrah (Jub. 20:6), but this is only the paramount paradigm of Canaan (Jub. 20:4). Accordingly, the general law to burn the fornicating unmarried woman is followed by the warning against any sexual alliance with her and this is directly combined with the refusal of mixed marriages in a significant way:

\textsuperscript{17} Translation NRSV.

they are not to commit sexual offences (by) following their eyes and their hearts so that they take wives for themselves from the Canaanite women, because the descendants of Canaan will be uprooted from the earth.\textsuperscript{19}

By referring to Canaan and especially Sodom and Gomorrah, “fornication” and “pollution” are linked strongly to a certain ethos. It seems obvious that the paradigm of religious imperilment (Exod 34:15–16; Deut 7:3–4; 1 Kgs 11 etc.) is implicitly present and combined with the purity paradigm by the terms “fornication” and “pollution.” Any illicit sexual encounter is regarded as defiling (\textit{Jub.} 7:21–22; 16:7; 20:4–5; 22:7–8; 30:15; 35:15)\textsuperscript{20} and especially mixed marriages are potentially (permanently) defiling for the “holy seed.”\textsuperscript{21}

(2) This holds true for the second admonition in \textit{Jub.} 21, which is addressed to Isaac in the first part and relates to cultic matters surprisingly.\textsuperscript{22} He is charged to observe the blood taboo and he shall be pure in all cultic acts and times (\textit{Jub.} 21:16). After that, in vv. 21–23, he is committed to separate from the nations:

I see, my son, that all the actions of mankind (consist of) sin and wickedness and all their deeds of impurity, worthlessness, and contamination. With them there is nothing that is right. Be careful not to walk in their ways or to tread in their path… Depart from all their actions and from all their impurity. Keep the obligations of the most high God…

Again, the behavior of the Gentiles is devaluated with categories of purity as defilement, pollution and contamination, and Isaac is encouraged to avoid any contact. Because the admonition is addressed to Isaac, who is married already to Rebecca, the issue of intermarriage takes a back seat for a while. Nevertheless, it is implicitly present within the scheme of preference (Jacob) and discrimination (Esau) which is reported several times in the whole chapter (cf. \textit{Jub.} 21:15–31).


\textsuperscript{22} The material in this chapter has parallels in the Aramaic Levi, see Vander-Kam, \textit{Jubilees}, 56.
(3) The final testimony of Abraham focuses on Jacob in Jub. 22. He is blessed to be a “holy people” (Jub. 22:12) and all the blessings of Adam and Noah shall rest on his seed (Jub. 22:13). Jacob is especially committed to the regulations of Abraham (Jub. 22:15) which refers back among others to Jub. 20:4–5 (see above). This becomes clear in the following verse:

Separate from the nations, and do not eat with them. Do not act as they do, and do not become their companion, for their actions are something that is impure and all their ways are defiled and something abominable and detestable. (Jub. 22:16)

The proscription of table fellowship resorts evidently to the prohibition of alliance in Exod 34:15–16 and the narrative in Num 25 (especially 25:2). Both associate the sacrificial communion with the connubium in a significant way. The abominations of the nations are further substantiated by the inclusion of other references: Deut 26:14 (יִבְחָהּ וְלֹא תֵלְמַת); 32:17 (בראשית וַיִּלְקָחָה); Ps 106:28 (זָדוֹן וְלֹא אֲדֹנִי); Ps 106:35–37 (esp. וַיִּשָּׂא אֲדֹנִי לָעַלְשִׁים וַיֶּלֶדֶת אֵלֶּיה); Isa 65:4 (קָבַרְנוּ), with the idol polemics of Pss 115:4–8; 135:15–18 (equation of idolaters with the incapability of the idols); Jer 10:3, 5, 15 (יִשְׂרָאֵל) and Jer 2:27; 3:9 (עֵין אֲדֹנָי). Thus, Jub. 22:17–18 states:

They offer their sacrifices to the dead and they worship demons. They eat in tombs, and everything they do is empty and worthless. They have no mind to think, and their eyes do not see what they do and how they err in saying to (a piece of) wood: “You are my Lord; you are my deliverer.” (They have) no mind.

As in Jub. 20, assimilation to the nations is associated with idolatry and defilement. Especially Jacob is warned against becoming a companion of the Gentiles. This is certainly because of his figurative identity with Israel, but may also already hint at the situation in Shechem narrated in Jub. 30. In Jacob’s case, the abominations are colorfully emphasized and he is notably directed toward the guidance of the Lord, who shall turn him from all the impurities of the nations (Jub. 22:19). Two possibilities explain why Jacob seems to be eminently in need of that support: he has to turn outside the land because of his courtship for Rachel and Lea with Laban in Mesopotamia (Gen 28–33, cf. Jub. 24–29) or because of his encounter with the Shechemites in the Dinah affair (Gen 34, cf. Jub. 30). That the latter is already in mind may become obvious when looking more closely at the passage and comparing Jub. 22 with Jub. 25 and Jub. 30. First, one has to note that the mixed marriage topic is subsequently stressed in the testimony of Isaac:
Be careful, my son, Jacob, not to marry a woman from all the descendants of Canaan’s daughters, because all of his descendants are (meant) for being uprooted from the earth. (Jub. 22:20)

The commandment is not given by Isaac, as it is in Gen 28:1–2 (cf. Jub. 27:7–10), but by Abraham shortly before his death (Jub. 23:2) and is thus highlighted with special emphasis. It is exactly this commandment to which Jub. 25:5 and other passages refer. Once more it is substantiated by the allusion to the moral inferiority of the sons of Canaan especially by referring to their idolatrous practices, which are put on the same level with sexual deviations represented by the Sodom narrative (Jub. 22:21–22).

Concerning the imperative of endogamy, Jacob is totally obedient, as can be seen in the dialog with his mother Rebecca (Jub. 25). Because of her disgust, caused by the presence of Esau’s wives (again associated with impurity, fornication and lust), she underlines the desire for Jacob’s endogamy in Jub. 25:1–3. Jacob answers with reference to the demand of Abraham (Jub. 22:20) in Jub. 25:5. His righteousness and obedience is referenced comprehensively throughout the book of Jubilees (see, for instance, Jub. 31 or the Reuben affair in Jub. 33:7–9). Apart from his attitude against his brother (which is accepted entirely in the book of Jubilees), the only passage in which Jacob’s active righteousness is overshadowed by passiveness is the account on Gen 34 in Jub. 30. Although the book of Jubilees is far from criticizing Jacob, as the Hebrew Bible does implicitly in the rebuke of Simeon and Levi in Gen 34:30 (cf. Jub. 30:25), and although Jacob seems to agree with the harsh punishment of the Shechemites, he remains inactive in the Dinah story, while his sons are proactive. This may be seen as a compromise between unavoidable sin and justified revenge. It may become intelligible if one resumes the election of his seed as reported in the testimony of Abraham in Jub. 22. In this context Jub. 22:14 is quite remarkable: “May he purify you from all filthy pollution so that you may be pardoned for all the guilt of your sins of ignorance.”

Which issue is addressed by the purity terminology and what are the transgressions which he has committed ignorantly? Is this meant only generally? One may read this statement also as an anticipation of Jacob’s passiveness in the Shechem affair in Jub. 30 from which God shall withdraw. The revenge of Simeon and Levi against the Shechemites is displayed as exemplary regarding the separation from the nations in Jub. 30 and is evaluated significantly in the heavenly record (Jub. 30:23). According to Jub. 30:25, the proactive intervention of the sons of Jacob
caused merciful preservation of Jacob by God. Hence, the action of Simeon and Levi can be seen as God’s providence in favor of Jacob as requested by Abraham in Jub. 22.

In sum: The Abraham testimonies in Jub. 20–22 set the agenda regarding the rejection of interethnic marriages in the book of Jubilees. The issue is implemented within the frame of the demand for separation. Therefore the ethos of the Gentiles is demonstrated to be inferior throughout the text, using the highly charged domain of sexuality. By forming the key concepts of fornication, adultery, defilement and sexual deviation any sexual contact with foreigners is regarded as violation of Abraham’s laws and as a challenge to the blessing of election.

The development of the argument in Jub. 20–22 was characterized by a productive, transformative and additive reception of several biblical pre-texts. Jubilees 20 and 22 already allude to the Dinah-story, which forms the core of the mixed marriage thread in Jubilees, and significant aspects are predetermined in these chapters. Thus, the foundation for the evaluation of the proactive intervention of Simeon and Levi is already laid here. Before turning to the central aspects of the Dinah story and some significant transformations of Gen 34 in Jub. 30, we must introduce briefly the mixed marriage topic in Gen 34.

3. Some Introductory Remarks on Genesis 34

Genesis 34, the so-called Rape of Dinah, presents one of the most troubling stories in the book of Genesis. The readers are challenged to deal with rape and apparently treacherous slaughter: sexual and political violence are intertwined. The narrative opens with Jacob’s daughter Dinah being raped and thereby becoming defiled by Shechem, the son of the local ruler Hamor (vv. 2, 5). Hamor proposes marriage for Dinah and Shechem, as well as a general policy of intermarriage between the two peoples (vv. 8–10). Dinah’s brothers, who are distressed and angered by the “outrage” committed by Shechem (v. 7), seemingly accept this proposal, answering that intermarriage in general is fine, but only on condition that the Shechemites all undergo circumcision (vv. 14–24). While the Shechemites are recovering from their circumcision, Simeon and Levi kill all the males and the other sons of Jacob plunder the town (vv. 25–29). Jacob upbraids Simeon and Levi for their actions, which endangered Jacob’s status in the land (v. 30), but Simeon and Levi are unrepentant. The story concludes with their question, “Should he treat our sister like a whore?” (v. 31), which underlines the rejection of intermarriages by
pointing out Dinah’s lasting degradation in social status. This narrated conflict seems to be consistently dominated by the notion that interethnic contacts, and especially interethnic sexual contacts, are fraught with problems (except for the special case of the martial law, cf. Gen 34:29; Deut 21:10–14). Furthermore, an ethical dilemma concerning collective penalty, social status resp. honor and Dinah’s humiliation is evoked. Is it acceptable to use violence as punishment of misdoing on the one hand and as political instrument to prevent certain mixtures on the other hand?

In the scholarly discussion, Gen 34 is mainly analyzed with regard to its complex literary history and to the understanding of the sexual assault (rape vs. abduction marriage). I will not deal with these undoubtedly important topics here. Without marginalizing the “rape” of Dinah, I would like to propose a reading of Gen 34 which concentrates on the aspect of mixed marriages. In its final form Gen 34 is a complex post-exilic text which is already close to a halakhic Midrash. The application of several commandments of the Torah to Gentiles is checked: Gen 17; Exod 22:15–16; 34:15–16; Num 31, and more intensively Deut 7:3–5; 22:21, 28–29. The focus is on the following question: “How are


interethnic sexual contacts and their consequences to be dealt with?" For instance: must one to apply the legislation on rape in Deut 22:28–29 if the perpetrator is a foreigner? In Gen 34 this problem is linked to sexual (sexual violence), social (honor), socio-economic (bride-price), social-legal (forced marriage), religious (circumcision, or rather conversion) and ethic (murder) aspects—and in this culmination or combination, respectively, it is unique within the scope of biblical texts dealing with intermarriages. In its final form Gen 34 represents a generally restrictive attitude towards interethnic sexual contacts and more specifically mixed marriages, since de facto the position of Simeon and Levi is established at the end. Their radical refusal of interethnic marriages is not explicitly substantiated in the text, but implicitly founded by the recourse to, the dispute over, the interpretation and the tightening of several biblical traditions (cf. e.g. the various patterns for justification in Gen 34: the [social] status, the purity, and the holiness of Israel). Although the refusal is exemplarily accomplished regarding the marriage of an Israelite maiden with a foreign man, and although Gen 34:29 implies marital relations with foreign woman according Deut 21:10–14, the direction of impact is quite clear: a radical refusal of every interethnic sexual relation. In doing so Gen 34 sheds light on the polyphonic post-exilic/pre-Hellenistic discourse on intermarriage.

4. Genesis 34 within the Post-Exilic/Pre-Hellenistic Discourse on Intermarriage

Understanding Gen 34 in its final form as a “halakhic” discourse on interethnic (sexual) contacts resp. intermarriages, we have to raise the question of which attitudes towards intermarriages are attested by Gen 34 within this post-exilic/pre-Hellenistic discussion. As already indicated, in Gen 34 those various attitudes are closely linked to the question of circumcision. The demand for circumcision does not only function as a narrative device in order to enable the trickery initiated by Jacob’s sons, but has to be seen as a central topic of the narrative which is considered as a non-indispensable, an indispensable or an irrelevant precondition for Dinah’s marriage with her rapist. Therefore, Gen 34 turns out to be a discourse on possible preconditions for intermarriages. Three different attitudes can be found in the narrative—a favorable, a permissive, and a restrictive one. These will be discussed here in turn.

First, the position of Shechem and his father Hamor, who represent a proactive attitude towards intermarriages: for Shechem, the sexual assault against Dinah is not very problematic at all. From his point of
view Dinah’s defilement can be rescinded by marriage (cf. Gen 34:3–4) and the payment of an appropriate bride-price (cf. Gen 34:11–12). Shechem and Hamor do not mention any resistance or preconditions concerning this marriage. According to their opinion interethnic marriages are no problem. This is underlined by the general demand for intercultural marriages in Gen 34:9 and its replication in Gen 34:21. Both are linguistically related to Deut 7:3 and Exod 34:16. In Gen 34:23 the Shechemites point out that interethnic marriage exclusively entail benefits (e.g. economic advancement).

Second, the position of Jacob who stands for a permissive attitude towards mixed marriages: although his stance on Dinah’s “rape” and on exogamous intercultural marriages in general is not explicitly mentioned in the text, a permissive attitude towards mixed marriages is implied by Jacob’s inactivity and his silence in view of Dinah’s defilement (Gen 34:5), his uncommented acceptance of the capture of women and his reaction to the murder of the Shechemites and the depredation of the city. In this context Jacob intervenes for the first time and accuses Simeon and Levi of jeopardizing by their actions the survival of the entire clan. He fears the revenge of the Canaanites. From Jacob’s point of view the circumcision of Shechem and the following wedding seem to be adequate requirements resp. sufficient preconditions for approving an interreligious marriage which reestablishes the lost honor. Therefore Jacob’s behavior implies a legal position which states that Deut 22:28–29, with its claim for marriage and a payment of compensation, can also be employed on intercultural premarital, and in the case under consideration, enforced sexual contacts. 26 Maybe his silence with regard to Shechem’s and Hamor’s offer hints at a neutrality of the position represented by Jacob, which neither rejects intercultural marriage in general, nor euphorically welcomes it. This attitude could be called a rather pragmatic one.

Third, we can identify the position of Simeon and Levi, who represent a restrictive attitude towards intercultural resp. interreligious marriages. Sexual contacts with foreigners are considered a violation of the social integrity of the involved clan (cf. Gen 34:7). Bearing in mind Deut 22:21 resp. 2 Sam 13:12–13, it appears to be evident that, following this line of argument, Dinah became unmarriageable because of Shechem’s actions. On condition that a marriage with Shechem is excluded on principle, this has to be considered a defilement of Dinah and a violation of the honor of Jacob’s clan. Therefore the proposal of the circumcision as

precondition for marriage (Gen 34:14–17) has been designed by Dinah’s brothers as a ruse (חמלת) from the start. Simeon and Levi never did even take into consideration that the circumcision could function as a precondition for an intercultural marriage and that the defilement could be rescinded in that way. In their opinion Dinah has been treated like a prostitute (Gen 34:31). For a harlot extramarital sexual contacts do not affect or more specifically denigrate her social status. But the brothers claim implicitly: Dinah is a daughter instead. Because Dinah was subordinated to patriarchal power of direction and custody, her honor is permanently compromised and Jacob’s honor impacted as well. This prompts an ethnic affair: the Shechemites are killed just like the Midianites in Num 31:7–12, where the interethnic illegitimate sexual relationship between Zimri and Cozbi (cf. Num 25:7–8; 31:16) functions as the rationale for the Midianite war. Simeon and Levi’s attitude does not establish the ban on exogamous intercultural marriages, but calls for it. Three Deuteronomic laws resp. legal issues (Deut 22:28–29; 20:14; 21:10–14, respectively) which implicitly include the possibility of exogamous marriages are interpreted and specified. Using the example of the “raped” Dinah, the final-form of the text of Gen 34 discusses whether Deut 22:28–29 can be applied to intercultural resp. interreligious marriages of daughters on condition of the conversion (expressed by the circumcision). The answer that is given by the text differentiates between the proposal of marriage after a dishonoring rape and the marriage of female prisoners of war. The former is explicitly and exclusively—even on condition of circumcision—prohibited. But including the note of the deprivation of the Shechemite women and children (Gen 34:29), it is implicitly stated by using the example of the Shechemite’s punishment (cf. Deut 20:14) that an exogamous marriage is acceptable for female captives and under-age female children. Concerning the legal principles, this attitude is (apart from the demand for virginity) identical to Num 25:16–18; 31:7–12, 18.

It is important to state that Gen 34 is only one voice within the polyphonic post-exilic discourse on mixed marriages. It takes up three different positions of this discourse, trying to demonstrate that its own is the right and legal one. Although it reflects three different positions within this discourse—a proactive one, a permissive one, and a restrictive one—its concluding appraisal is definitive: in its final form the text represents a firm disclaiming attitude towards interethnic marriages of Israelite women—the position of Simeon and Levi is de facto established and implemented. Deuteronomy 22:28–29 is applied in so far as it is stated that the payment of compensation for the father of the raped daughter only comes into use within the context of intra-ethnic marriages.
Simeon and Levi’s attitude is not founded in the text, but furthermore morally charged by סמה את דינה והמור. Thus the latter is linked to the paradigm of purity, which forms the background of the rejection. Although the term סמה (Gen 34:5, 13, 27) has a cultic connotation, it often functions as a *terminus technicus* in the context of mixed marriage texts signifying illegitimate and mostly extramarital sexual contacts. סמה does not refer to a ritual-cultic impurity here, but labels a state which is generated by extramarital and any kind of morally reprehensible sexual contacts. By using this term, the relationship between Shechem and Dinah is significantly marked as illegitimate. The “rape” of Dinah by Shechem is classified as prohibited premarital sexual intercourse. The degradation of Dinah’s status is durable and cannot be revoked by the payment of compensation (cf. Deut 22:28–29) because it concerns interethic contacts. It is not by chance that Simeon and Levi are the main protagonists with regard to the punishment of the Shechemites. Especially Levi represents the radical rejection of interethic exogamous marriages (cf. Num 25:6–9; Mal 2).

As has been demonstrated, Gen 34 cannot be dismissed from the post-exilic discourse on mixed marriages. The restricted attitude, which is mainly promoted and forced by priestly circles, is based on an ideology of separation of Israel as chosen people from the other nations especially promoted by the book of Leviticus (Lev 20:24–26). The purity regulations of the priests shall be transferred to all people. Therefore, Lev 19:29; 21:1–5 and Lev 21:14, as well as the supposed holiness of Israel in general, are to be considered in the background of the narrative. Even those aspects, the purity and the holiness of Israel, will play a significant role within the reception of Gen 34 in *Jub.* 30 and expose a “shift” in the patterns for justification of the ban on intermarriages. I will now turn to this reception, first looking at the rough structure and then pointing at the significant modifications between Gen 34 and *Jub.* 30.

**5. The Reception of Genesis 34 in Jubilees 30: Baselines and Significant Modifications**

The narrative of Gen 34 is referred to explicitly merely in the framework of the chapter in *Jub.* 30:1–4, 23–26. In the Jubilees version the significantly modified narrative has an extensive parenetic-halakhic justification of Simeon’s and Levi’s actions inserted into vv. 6–22. This halakha establishes a general prohibition of mixed marriages which is assigned to the “heavenly tablets.” Verses 5–6 bridge the narrative and the interpreting passage with a general prohibition. The verses are arranged in a concentric order:
A: Nothing like this is to be done anymore from now on—to defile an Israelite woman.

B1: For the punishment had been decreed against them in heaven
B2: that they were to annihilate all the Shechemites with the sword,

C: since they have done something shameful in Israel.

B2/g397: The Lord handed them over to Jacob’s sons
B1/g397: for them to uproot them with the sword and to effect punishment against them

A/g397: and so that there should not again be something like this within Israel—defiling an Israelite virgin.

The deed of Simeon and Levi is authorized and the motif of honor and shame (cf. Gen 34:7, 31) is put into the centre of the Jubilees narrative. After interpreting the heavenly demand of punishment (vv. 5b, 6), the halakha generalizes the prohibition of intermarriage and imposes the death penalty for the father or brother (stoning v. 7a) and the daughter or sister (burning v. 7b) involved with this misdeed. The responsibility of the father is consistent (Exod 34:16; Deut 7:3);27 only if his responsibility has ended with death must the brothers assume this duty. It is important to note that the shift of the story’s setting and of Jacob’s attitude prevents him from being included in the verdict of v. 7. Had the permissive attitude in Gen 34 regarding a marriage with Shechem been adopted, Jacob would be a man who “wishes to give his daughter to a foreigner.” According to the legacy promoted by Jubilees he should be stoned. Yet, as noted above, Dinah was seduced by the Shechemites and defiled by Shechem, and Jacob is completely in line with his sons regarding the anger about that (Jub. 30:3). Thus he was threatened but did not consent.

However, the sentencing of a father for giving away his daughter to the Gentiles already has a “hypotext” in Lev 20:2–5, especially if one assumes a figura etymologica מנה נמות in the original Hebrew text, which is followed in Jub. 30:7 by the stoning sentence as in Lev 20:2 (רומניהEgyptian).28 As has been noted above, the sentence of burning refers back to Jub. 20:4 and thus Jub. 30 is linked to the paramount exhortation of Abraham. Compared to Jub. 20:4, the emphasis on Lev 21:9 is distinct. In Lev 21:9 a priest’s daughter (בת איש חוץ) is sentenced to death because she has desecrated her father (אשה_frontend אשה מקדישית) by illicit sexual relations (כי חותר להונת). The proximity to Jub. 30:7 is obvious: the profanation of the sanctity of the priestly father correlates

with the pollution of the name of the Israelite father’s house by a
daughter who enters into an intercultural marriage. Mixed marriages are
interpreted as illegitimate sexual relations and one considered to be
morally no different than adultery, fornication or incest. Following Jub.
30, intermarriage is not only an improper mixing with foreign people, but
casts the very core of Israel: its holiness. Israel is considered “a
kingdom of priests and a holy nation” (Exod 19:6, cf. Jub. 16:18; 30:8;
33:20). According to Hayes,

Jubilees establishes that the entire nation of Israel is categorically distinct
from other peoples, that all Israel are holy priests. Once all Israel is ele-
vated to the status of holy priests (nay, Angels!), the application to all
Israel of priestly standards of ritual and marital purity is the next logical
step.

Accordingly, all regulations which are related to the particular priestly
state are applied to the whole people. Mixed marriages affect the status
of “holiness,” not because of “purity” and “holiness” are fully converti-
bles here, but rather because “holiness” reveals the status of election
and segregation. Any “impurity” is considered as being contrary to that
manner. It is this conceptual mélange which makes it problematic to

29. G renders τὸ δῶμα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῆς (cf. also 4Q213a). If one may assume
the reading of ב ב ב ב ב ב in 4Q26a attesting Lev 21:9 or perhaps a combination of G
and 4Q26a, the link of Jub. 30:7 to Lev 21:9 would be all the more conclusive.

30. Cf. further Jub. 33 and Jub. 41:25–27. דוד may comprise not only sexual
activity but marital relations as well. Cf. 4QMMT B 75–82; 4Q513 Frag. 2; T. Levi
The linkage between Jub. 30 and Lev 21:7, 9 would be the more convincing if
Jubilees would have known the Aramaic Levi Document, 4Q213a (= 4QLevi\b Frag.
3–4) resp. the traditions behind it. For a discussion of this fragmentary text, see
Greenfield et al., Aramaic Levi; Joseph Blenkinsopp, Ezra–Nehemiah: A Commen-
tary (OTL; London: SCM, 1989), 220–21; Joseph M. Baumgarten, “Some ‘Qum-
Weinfeld Jubilee Volume. Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East, Qumran,
and Post-Biblical Judaism (ed. C. Cohen et al.; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns,
2004), 393–401 (400).

31. Segal, Jubilees, 279–81; Schwarz, Identität, 93, 95; John C. Endres, “Prayers
in Jubilees,” in Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient
Judaism (ed. L. LiDonnic and A. Lieber; JSSup 119; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 31–47,
170.

32. Hayes, Gentile Impurities, 74; cf. John C. Endres, Biblical Interpretation in
the Book of Jubilees (CBQMS 18; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of
America, 1987), 139–40.

33. Cf. the Damascus Document or the Temple Scroll. See Berger, Das Buch der
Jubiläen, 471; cf. further Harrington, Purity Texts.
differentiate between ritual, moral, and genealogical aspects of purity. “The demarcation of types of impurity should (thus) not be too rigid.”

As already coined in *Jub.* 20, mixed marriages are associated with adultery and defilement. Compared to *Jub.* 20–22 it is striking that v. 8a adds the explicit substantiation to the prohibition “because Israel is holy to the Lord” (cf. *Jub.* 22:12, 27). Any transgression shall be sentenced (v. 8b) as recorded in the tablets of heaven (v. 9), because otherwise “there is no remission or forgiveness” (v. 10). It is important to note that already v. 8b relates the defilement of mixed marriages to the sanctuary of the Lord just as vv. 15, 17 do explicitly. Intermarriages are considered as severe infractions which affect not only the couple and the immediate family, but also the whole congregation and the centre of holiness: they defile the sanctuary and profane the name of the Lord (v. 15). According to Berger, “Die Mischehe ist daher als direkte Befleckung der Heiligkeit des Tempels verstanden.” This interpretation is a key for the understanding not only of the prohibition but also of the reference to Lev 20:2–5:

The defilement of the sanctuary is not caused by direct contact or an actual transgression of the real boundaries of the holy precinct. It is the permanent moral defilement caused by intermarriage which defiles the sanctuary rather than the physical impurity of the Gentiles. The holiness of the sanctuary is strongly linked to the holiness of the people. This conception is already present in biblical texts such as Num 19:13, 20 or Lev 15:31:

The Pentateuch presents three types of acts or processes that defile the sanctuary from afar: offering progeny to Molech, an offense expunged by stoning the offender; corpse defilement, punished by excision unless one makes atonement; and failure to make expiation after a genital discharge, which one can rectify through purification rites, including sacrifice. Of the three scriptural cases, only the first admits no possibility of absolution through purification. The sole corrective is the physical removal of the sinner from the nation.

34. Doering, “Purity and Impurity,” 272.
35. The Latin text attests the pronoun *eum*, which is assumed in most translations (see Berger, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, 472; VanderKam, *Jubilees*, 194), but usually related to Israel. A singular pronoun is attested in v. 10 in the Ethiopic Ge’ez text. That all these references should not be related to Israel becomes clear from vv. 15 and 17, where the defilement of the sanctuary is addressed.
Thus the pollution caused by intermarriage cannot be solved by purity rituals (Jub. 30:10, 14, 16). Yet the impurity is not merely “moral,” as can be seen in the defilement of the sanctuary. Two times it is underlined that the man who causes defilement by giving away his daughter to the Gentiles has to die (v. 9), and the sanction is justified in the heavenly tablets: “for this is the way it has been ordained and written on the heavenly tablets regarding any descendant of Israel who defiles (it).” The reference to the heavenly record, which is a specific form of authorization in the book of Jubilees, occurs four times in Jub. 30:9, 19, 20, 22.³⁸ F. García Martínez identifies five categories of usage of the phrase: (1) tablets of the law (Jub. 3:9–11; 4:5; 16:3–4; 33:10–12), (2) heavenly register of good and evil (Jub. 19:9; 30:19–22), (3) predestinating records (Jub. 5:13–14; 16:9; 24:33; 23:32; 31:32; 32:21–22), (4) calendar and feast (Jub. 6:17, 28–29, 30–35; 18:19; 32:27–29; 49:8), and finally (5) introducing new halakhot (Jub. 3:31; 4:32; 15:25; 28:6; 30:9; 32:10–15).³⁹ Within the wide array of usage the last category is most interesting for the interpretation of Jub. 30. As García Martínez notes, “The HT [Heavenly Tablets] constitute a hermeneutical recourse which permits the presentation of the ‘correct’ interpretation of the Law, adapting it to the changing situations of life.”⁴⁰ This hermeneutical recourse is rather aiming at interpretation or at additional aspects than at a substitution of the law. “The authority of the HT (Heavenly Tablets) is invoked anew for the imposition of a halakha which has no biblical basis.”⁴¹ The new aspect of the halakha in Jub. 30 is the application of Lev 20:2–5 to intermarriages and their association with Molech worship. The general prohibition is thus authorized and characterized as already given in the heavenly Torah.

In vv. 7–9 the prohibition is skillfully generalized by forming an intertwining cluster, as is shown in the following figure:


⁴⁰. Ibid., 258.

⁴¹. Ibid., 257.
More or less surprisingly v. 10b adds another rationale for the punishment which argues with Lev 20:2–5: “because he has given some of his seed to Molech and sinned so as to defile it.” Regarding the new halakha introduced by the reference to the heavenly tablets, this is the new aspect of interpretation (see below).

The following verses, vv. 11–22, address Moses, who is summoned to establish a general prohibition of mixed marriages, one which resorts to Deut 7:3. Yet the imperilment is not cast as a religious one, but rather, by using the key word “reproach” (גֶּהֶנֶּמֶּן) from Gen 34:14, a moral one. Intermarriages are “impure and despicable for Israel” (Jub. 30:13) and they cause defilement of the sanctuary of the Lord, profanation of his holy name and thus plague and curse (v. 15). Because Simeon and Levi have prevented the people from this, their action is singled out as exemplary: “it was recorded as a just act for them” (v. 17). Regarding Levi, this is elaborated further in the election of the tribe of Levi in vv. 18–20, which alludes to the Phinehas episode in Num 25. Because of his zealous engagement,42 Levi is—as Abraham in Jub. 19:19—recorded as friend and righteous (v. 19). Within this line of argument the groups which adhere to Simeon and especially Levi as ancestors are configured as preservers of Israel’s state of holiness.

Although there can be no doubt that Gen 34 is the background of the reception in Jub. 30, there can be found a lot of significant differences between the texts. It has to be stressed that every altered aspect is grounded implicitly in Gen 34. Jubilees 30 completely focuses on the difficulty of mixed marriages and the ban on exogamous bonds. Thus, any sexual contact with Gentiles is depreciated by applying the paradigm of defilement. Compared to Gen 34, a tightening which is linked to a shift within the halakhic discourse can be observed with regard to the legacy. In sum, Jub. 30 contains the following significant modifications towards Gen 34:

1. In Jub. 30 Dinah is entirely inactive. She is turned into an object completely by this depiction: first of robbery (executed by the Shechemites; cf. Jub. 30:2a), then of sexual intercourse and defilement (Shechem;
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(2) The focus is not on the sexual offense (*Jub.* 30:2), but on Dinah’s kidnapping into Shechem’s house (cf. *T. Levi* 6:8). The illegitimacy of the sexual intercourse is therefore not constituted by the “rape” of the twelve-year-old Dinah, corresponding to a decline in status, but by the sexual contact with Gentiles in general (*Jub.* 30:3, 5). While Dinah and her family’s loss of civil rights was involved in Gen 34, status and honor play only a marginal role in *Jub.* 30 (*Jub.* 30:7, 12). By using the term נשה (cf. Gen 34:5, 13, 27)—which becomes a *leitmotif* (*Jub.* 30:2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 15, 16, 22)—the sexual contact (*Jub.* 30:2) and already Dinah’s abduction in order to marry her (*Jub.* 30:4) is qualified as defilement.

(3) There is no affection between Shechem and Dinah. The request for marriage is significantly addressed to Jacob and not to Hamor.43 The appeal for marriage is not substantiated in *Jub.* 30; neither by Shechem’s affection nor by economical benefits like in Gen 34:9–10, 21, 23. Out of the three positions towards mixed marriages in Gen 34, only the restrictive one of Simeon and Levi can be found in *Jub.* 30. In this respect Jacob and his sons form an integral whole there. Neither the permissive attitude of Jacob nor the proactive position of Shechem and his father Hamor or of the Shechemites has been adopted. Shechem’s quest for marriage remains unsubstantiated and uncommented upon. There are no negotiations or preconditions for potential exogamous marriages; the rejection of the marriage is out of question, “because they had polluted Dinah, their sister” (*Jub.* 30:4). Jacob and his sons refuse, and they act with hostility from the beginning (*Jub.* 30:4). A consultation between Jacob and his sons on the following proceeding does not take place, though “Simeon and Levi entered Shechem unexpectedly and effected punishment on all the Shechemites” (*Jub.* 30:4). Jacob remains passive but permissive to the revenge of Simeon and Levi rather than to the liaison between Dinah and Shechem.

(4) Although circumcision is involved in *Jub.* 15:11–14; 16:14–15, 26; 17:17; 20:3, this subject matter of Gen 34 is not mentioned in *Jub.* 30. There is no negotiation on circumcision (Gen 34:13–17) as a “solution” for the problem and a note about Shechem’s (Gen 30:19) and the Shechemites’ (Gen 34:22–24) willingness to convert. Even the motif of the Shechemites’ weakening by traumatic fever (Gen 34:25) is missing.

43. For the text-critical option for “his” or rather “her” father, see VanderKam, *Jubilees*, 191; Berger, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, 470.
Jubilees 30 is completely “immune to the remedy of circumcision.” Although circumcision is mentioned once in the middle section of the text in Jub. 30:12, there can be no doubt that according to Jub. 30 there is no possibility of conversion for Gentiles. Therefore Jub. 30 is completely in line with Simeon and Levi’s attitude towards mixed marriages. Israel is considered a separate group which would be defiled by sexual congress (and all the more by intermarriages) with any Gentile. This extreme opinion, a general objection to conversion, is “fueled by the holy / profane—rather than ritually pure / impure-distinction.”

(5) The ban on intermarriage is radically extended to any sexual contact with Gentiles, because sexual congress can be positively sanctioned only within the legal context of marriages. Therefore any kind of sexual contact with Gentiles is prohibited and appraised as defilement. In doing so, Jub. 30 is beyond the scope of Gen 34.

(6) On the one hand, Jacob and his sons no longer represent two different positions within the discourse on mixed marriages, but on the other hand the reactive action is limited to Simeon and Levi. Their actions are displayed as exemplary and any critique concerning their behavior is eliminated. Jubilees 30 does not contain a rebuke of Simeon and Levi’s reaction as found in Gen 49:5–7. In fact, their act of punishment is enshrined in the heavenly law (see below). The concluding verse, Jub. 30:25, emphasizes that their actions are also acknowledged by God. According to Jub. 30, the procedure against sexual contacts with Gentiles—which could lead to mixed marriages—has to be carried out intransigently and fearlessly. By their action Simeon and Levi enabled the preservation of Israel which is granted by God. Therefore their representative actions are more than a generic punishment; they have to be considered as the facilitation of Israel’s existence.

(7) The orientation towards the laws of Deut 20:14; 21:10–14 and 22:28 and their specifications is lacking. Simeon and Levi kill every male (Jub. 30:4) and capture the livestock and the movable belongings, but there is no mention of women and children (cf. Gen 34:29) in the context of the foray. Although the punishment is applied explicitly only to all male Shechemites in Jub. 30:4–5, Jub. 30:17, 23 has inclusive phrases regarding gender. The women and children of Gen 34:29 are lacking in Jub. 30:24. Jubilees seems even to refuse the application of Deut 20:10–14 to the Shechemites implicitly. Leviticus 20 and Deut 7 take the place of the interpretation of the Deuteronomic laws.

44. Hayes, Gentile Impurities, 77.
45. Ibid.
In sum: in *Jub. 30* the discourse of Gen 34 on circumcision as precondition for intermarriages transforms into an *absolute* prohibition of mixed marriages which is revealed by using the example of Dinah. Out of the three positions towards mixed marriages in Gen 34—a proactive, a permissive, and a restrictive one—in *Jub. 30* only the restrictive and delimiting one of the sons of Jacob remains. Any sexual contact of Israelite women with Gentiles is condemned as defilement without specifying the mode of impurity, but by referring consistently to the holiness of Israel. But one of the most puzzling differences between Gen 34 and *Jub. 30* is that in the latter the ban on intermarriages does not refer to the “classic” texts Exod 34:12–16 or Deut 7:1–5 for the first instance. In fact, the prohibition of mixed marriages is substantiated by referring to Lev 20:2–5, a text which is not referred to in Gen 34 and where intermarriages are not mentioned at all: “…the man who caused defilement of his daughter will be rooted out from the midst of all Israel because he has given some of his seed to Molech and sinned so as to defile it” (*Jub. 30:10*). To understand this recourse to Lev 20 we must first take a closer look at the direction of impact of the book of *Jubilees* resp. of *Jub. 30*.

6. The Rationale for the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages in the Book of Jubilees

In the book of *Jubilees* the absolute refusal of intermarriages is grounded in the paradigm of purity/impurity and in the distinction between “holy” and “profane.” Any sexual contact with Gentiles is marked as polluting and therefore not commensurate to the holiness and purity of Israel. It is remarkable that the mode of purity in the book of *Jubilees* includes physical–ritual, moral and genealogical aspects as well. The refusal of intermarriages is pioneered in *Jub. 20–22* and culminates in the interpreting passage in *Jub. 30:5–23*, which establishes the general prohibition of mixed marriages with recourse to Lev 20:2–5. As has been argued above, the separation from the Gentiles is developed in *Jub. 20–22* as base for the evaluation of intermarriage. Within the testimonies of Abraham the demand for intraethnic endogamy was justified with regard to the moral inferiority of the Canaanites resp. Gentiles (*Jub. 20:4–6; 22:16–21*), their constitutional impurity (*Jub. 20:3; 21:21, 23; 22:14, 16, 19*) and their idolatry (*Jub. 20:8; 22:22*), rather than with clear references to the legislations of the Torah.
Especially the reception of Gen 34 in Jub. 30, which is developed as a kind of “rewritten Torah” or rather “rewritten scripture,” turned out to be a paramount instance of the radical refusal of intermarriages, now obviously substantiated with recourse to the Torah. The story of Dinah simply provides the peg for the general challenge in Jub. 30:7. The diametrical opposition between the “seed of the Gentiles” and the “seed of Israel” (cf. Jub. 30:9), as well as the reference to the holiness of Israel (Jub. 30:8), show that Jub. 30 reverts to the conception of the (Ezra 9:2) resp. the requirements of segregation in Neh 9:2 and to the idea of Israel as “holy people” (Lev 11:44–45; 19:2; 20:7, 26; Deut 7:6; 14:2, 21; 26:19, and also Exod 19:6). In this way the separation from the Gentiles is founded and permeated theologically by the category of election. Taking this line of argumentation for granted one may wonder why the ban on intermarriages does not refer to Exod 34:12–16 or Deut 7:1–5, but to Lev 20:2–5—a text where intermarriages are not mentioned at all. Though we just developed the “shift” in patterns for justification and the anti-Hellenistic direction of the book of Jubilees, the recourse to Lev 20 still remains puzzling. Because this reference presents one of the most striking differences between Gen 34 and Jub. 30, we have to raise the following questions: How did the author of Jub. 30 form the idea that Lev 20 could be interpreted as a ban on intermarriages? What made him do that?

Although Lev 20 occurs in the context of sexual taboos, a relation between Molech worship and intermarriages resp. interethnic sexual contacts is not that obvious at all. There are three possibilities: (1) the reference to mixed marriages is made explicit in the text of Leviticus by means of keywords and so on; (2) there are precursors in early Jewish literature for this interpretation and the author of Jubilees merely picked up a common understanding of Lev 20:2–5; or (3) the application of Lev 20 to intermarriages was an innovation by the author of Jubilees, who aimed at forming a new rationale for the prohibition of mixed marriages.

47. See the following works by Lange: “Eure Töchter”; “Your Daughters Do Not Give to Their Sons”; and “The Significance of the Pre-Maccabean Literature.”
Due to the fact that any re-interpretation presumes an original meaning, we have to address the question of Molech worship briefly. Without stressing the complex and controversial ongoing debate on the origins and the specific identity of Molech as well as on the interpretation of the offerings’ type (human sacrifice vs. ritual assignment) in length here again, I restrict myself to the following conclusion: from my point of view the evidence attests a symbolic assignment of children to a deity Baal / Hadad, or less probably Adad-milki, who was titled “king” (מלך) and possibly was identified with YHWH (cf. Jer 7:31; 19:5; 32:35). This ritual—the symbolic assignment as rite de passage—became popular in Judah in the eighth/seventh century B.C.E. because of Aramaic-Assyrian influence, though this assumption becomes less probable if 2 Kgs 17:31 does not refer back to an Assyrian influence. With regard to the question of the relation between Molech worship and intermarriage it is also important to state that the biblical Molech texts itself do not show any correlation to the sacrifice of the first-born or to sexual(-cultic) practices in general. Therefore, Molech’s reception in context of the prohibition of any sexual illegitimate relationship cannot be explained by recourse to the original impact of the ritual; it presupposes a reinterpretation in which Molech is not understood as a deity (anymore). This process of desemantization is presumed in Jub. 30. Hence, we should take a look at the exact meaning of מֶלֶךְ and מְלֹאכָה in Jub. 30.

The rabbinic tradition attests that Lev 18:21 and Lev 20:2–5 could have been understood in a sexual way, insofar as מְלֹאכָה (cf. Lev 18:20, 21 and Lev 20:2, 3, 4) is interpreted literally as “seed / sperm” (e.g. m. Megilla 4:9, Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, Targum Neofiti, Peshitta). Regarding Lev 18:21, Geza Vermes has studied the issue in a learned and encompassing article. He figures out three lines of interpretation of the post-biblical reception:


(1) The first one (LXX, Samaritan Pentateuch, Targum Onqelos, Samaritan Targum, Targum Neofiti) assumes לְבַנֵי לְאָם (sometimes explicitly altered to левре млеч) is interpreted as idolatry. As Vermes translates, “Thou (Israelite father) shalt not cause thy seed (i.e. children) to pass (i.e. serve, worship, be set aside for, be consecrated to) Molekh (an umbrella term for idolatry).” 52 Exemplarily, we may cite the LXX, which (a) reads or assumes לְבַנֵי instead of לְבַנֶּיהָ, and (b) understands לְבַנֶּיהָ either nominally as “king” or as participle to read “to the ruling one”: καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ στέρματός σου οὐ δώσεις λατρεύειν ἥρχοντα, “And you shall not give any of your offspring/semen to worship a ruler.” 53 Unless referring to 1 Sam 8:13, there is no sexual connotation in the LXX understanding, but rather a socio-critical one (to serve the ruler).

(2) The second line of interpretation interprets Lev 18:21 explicitly in a sexual way by taking לְבַנֶּיהָ literally as “semen” and interpreting לֵבַע instead of לַעֲבוּר as euphemism. The phrase לְבַע לְאָם is either taken euphemistically (denoting sexual intercourse) or taken as “to make pregnant.” This interpretation is attested in the Targum Pseudo Jonathan, in a marginal note to Targum Neofiti Lev 20:2 and in the Syriac version. The reading is further attested prominently in m. Megillah 4:9 in rejecting the understanding of the Targum:

If one say And thou shalt not give any of thy seed to pass through to Molech (מֹאָרְעַה אֲלֵא תֹּתְח לְבַע לְאָם) by And though shalt not give any of thy seed to a heathen woman to become pregnant (תֹּתְח אֲלֵא תֹּתְח לְבַע אֲלֵא תֹּתְח לְבַע אֲלֵא תֹּתְח), 54 they must silence him with a rebuke. 55

The rebuke has to be understood as an indulgent form of exclusion.\textsuperscript{56} The criticized reading is attested in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan to Lev 18:21 in combination with variant 1 (understanding מָלַךְ as umbrella term for idolatry):

\begin{quote}
And of your offspring/semen (תֵּין רֵעָה) you shall not give into intercourse (בַּחַת עָמָם) with a daughter of the people (בַּת עַמָּם) to make her pregnant in favor of a foreign service (לְמַלְּכוֹת נֶגְרָאָה), and you shall not profane the name of your God: I am the Lord.
\end{quote}

In reading \textit{wmn zw}’k l’ trm’ \textit{lmbtnw nwkrty}’, “you shall not let any of your semen cast into a strange women to cause her to be pregnant,”\textsuperscript{57} the Syriac version attests exactly this understanding. Because the heathen woman resp. the Aramaic woman of the mishnaic variant and the foreign woman of the Syriac are to be considered synonymous, this reading proscribes any sexual relation between Israelite men and non-Israelite women, or in other words any intermarriage.

(3) Following Vermes, a third line of interpretation is attested in \textit{m. Sanhedrin} 7:4. It is this interpretation that became halakha:

\begin{quote}
He who gives any of his seed to Molekh is guilty only if he gives (the child) to Molekh, and causes it to pass through the fire. If he gave it to Molekh but did not cause it to pass through the fire, or if he caused it to pass through the fire but did not give it to Molekh, he is not guilty. He must both give it to Molekh and cause it to pass through the fire.\textsuperscript{58}
\end{quote}

The concrete understanding of Lev 18:21 is left in abeyance (the Gemara points again at idolatry) and the sentence of stoning is \textit{de facto} suspended.

The second line is of special importance in regard to the passage in \textit{Jubilees}. However, it is rather more convincing in relation to Lev 18:21 (cf. Lev 18:20 as an associative anchor) than to Lev 20 where the explicit references to sexual taboos (Lev 20:11–21) are missing and a sexual understanding of מַלֶּכִי נְתַתָּה אָוָהִי נְתַתָּה אָוָהִי נֶגְרָאָה is impeded by the phrase מַלֶּכִי נְתַתָּה אָוָהִי נְתַתָּה אָוָהִי נֶגְרָאָה in Lev 20:5. This phrase can only be understood as a reference to a personal subject. Concerning the reception of Lev 20:2–5 in \textit{Jub.} 30 the sexual interpretation causes many problems: if \textit{רּוּעֶ} is understood as “seed / sperm,” then marriages between Gentile women and Israelite men would be prohibited, but not marriages between Israelite women and Gentile men. Yet the latter seems to be provided in Gen 34, which has to be considered the main background of \textit{Jub.} 30.


\textsuperscript{57} Translation by George M. Lansa.

\textsuperscript{58} Vermes, “Leviticus 18:21,” 117.
Furthermore, in *Jub.* 30 the reference to Lev 20:2–5 is obviously stronger than that of Lev 18:21; and we already pointed out that a sexual interpretation of Lev 20:2–5 is not that obvious. With regard to *Jub.* 30:9 (“For this is the way it has been ordained and written on the heavenly tablets regarding any descendant of Israel…”), it can be stated that the author of *Jub.* 30 understood עַדְנַי הַשָּׁמַיִם in the sense of “offspring” rather than literally in the sense of “semen.” But what meaning does the term “Molech” bear in the book of *Jubilees*? Based on *Jub.* 1:9 and 22:16–18, it seems quite plausible to understand “Molech” as a code/cipher for idolatry. But this impression fades when we consider the book of *Jubilees* as a whole, where the idolatry of the nations and the defilement by idolatry are not that important.

Although intermarriages are qualified as defilement by the nations, this is not traced back to their religions, but to their ethics, ethos and the lack of holiness. It is significant that there are no explicit references to Exod 34:15–16 or Deut 7:5, where intermarriages are considered religious threats. In fact the book of *Jubilees* is in line with the reception of Pentateuchal law in Ezra 9–10, where the concern for the intermingling of the holy seed with the nations is expressed: Israel’s state of holiness and its election is questioned by the contact with the nations.

Regarding the theology of election and seclusion of Israel in ethical terms, a similarity to Lev 18 and 20 is apparent. God segregated Israel from the nations by means of election (Lev 20:26; cf. Lev 20:24). He finds their ways disgusting (יְרֵמָו, cf. Lev 20:23) and he does not want Israel to act in this manner, because the ways of the nations defile Israel. In accordance with this line of understanding, the author of *Jub.* 30 interpreted Lev 20:2–5 in the sense of a ban on amalgamation or intermarriage with the nations. In Lev 18 and 20 he found a strategy of distinction which is based on a different sexual ethos of the nations.\(^59\)

Therein he considers his harsh refusal of any sexual contacts with Gentiles as justified. Because the book of *Jubilees* regards every sexual deviation as polluting, the subject of intermarriage is kept in mind implicitly in the context of Lev 20 and is explicitly embedded by the recourse to Molech.

The authors of *Jubilees* would have expected a ban on intermarriage *in Leviticus* due to the issues of purity and holiness. Since the basic chapters about Israel’s segregation from the “ways of the nations” do not contain an explicit prohibition of mixed marriages, it is substituted in *Jub.* 30 by the reinterpretation of the Molech passage in Lev 20:2–5.

\(^{59}\) For the combination of amalgamation with the nations, child sacrifice, idolatry and defilement one may suggest also Ps 106:35–36 as background.
Because there is no excuse or atonement for handing over a child to Molech, this law was convenient to be applied to the absolute refusal of interethnic relations. This sophisticated parallelization of Molech worship and intermarriage seems to be attested in the halakhic interpretation in *Jub.* 30 for the very first time. It is remarkable that this interpretation of Lev 20:2–5 does not require any justification, but is simply authorized by the recourse to the heavenly tablets. Via the paradigm of purity and the notion that any defilement is devastating for the sanctuary and the holiness of Israel the defilement of the daughter is characterized as pollution of the sanctuary (*Jub.* 30:10) and by this means equated with the worship of Molech (Lev 20:3).

7. Molech, מֹלֶךְ, ἀφανόω—An Additional Proposal

Assuming that *Jub.* 30 relates the Molech passage to mixed marriages for the very first time, I would like to propose another rationale for the adaptation of Lev 20:2–5 in *Jub.* 30:10, one which takes the Hellenistic “context” of the book of *Jubilees* into consideration and is based on the reception of Gen 34 in the LXX. According to the scholarly discussion, there can be no doubt that the book of *Jubilees* was originally written in Hebrew. But it cannot be excluded that the authors and the addressees of the book of *Jubilees* knew Greek and the Hellenistic literature, as C. Werman has stated recently.60 In view of the fact that the direction of impact of the book of *Jubilees* is anti-Hellenistic, from my point of view it seems quite plausible that the authors knew the position they were dealing with and therefore they also should have been familiar with the LXX. Looking at Lev 18:21 and Lev 20:2–5 in the LXX there appears to be an anomaly concerning “Molech.” Except for the later translations of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodosius at Lev 18:21 and Lev 20:2, 3, 4, 5, Molech is not read as a personal name or the name of a deity (cf. 2 Kgs 23:10; Jer 39:35; Amos 5:26), but as ἀφανόω, “ruler” (and not βασιλεύς, “king,” which is the usual translation for מֹלֶךְ). By using ἀφανόω instead of Mολευχ both passages are removed from the cultic context (although λατρεύω has cultic connotations often denoting to worship rather than to serve), reinterpreted and, especially in the case of Lev 20, linked to the topic of mixed marriages. This is emphasized especially by the associated keywords in Gen 34 (LXX) and *Jub.* 30 (e.g. זִוְה, שָׁם, מֶה). Yet the crucial impact for the connection of Molech worship and Gen 34 can be seen in the replacing of מֹלֶךְ by ἀφανόω, because Hamor—the father of

60. Werman, “Jubilees in the Hellenistic Context.”
Shechem—is called in Gen 34 ἄρχων: Συχεμ ὁ υἱὸς Εμμωρ ὁ Χερραῖος ὁ ἄρχων τῆς γῆς. Thus Shechem may be ἄρχων as well. On condition that the authors of the book of Jubilees knew the transfer made by the LXX, perhaps they simply held on to the Hebrew lexeme by interpreting it in the sense of the LXX’s reception as “ruler.” In so doing (and not taking up the extensive but obscure transformation of the LXX⁶¹), in Lev 20:2–5, by the interplay τῆς ἄρχων (note esp. the generalizing plural in Lev 20:5), there could be incorporated an explicit link to intermarriages resp. to any sexual contacts with Gentiles (Jub. 30); and a general prohibition of mixed marriages could be placed within the requirement of Lev 18 and 20. This proposal, which may be seen as too far-fetched, is not meant to replace the main theory discussed above, namely the reinterpretation and the assumption that the authors of Jubilees asked for a general prohibition of mixed marriages in the book of Leviticus. Yet it may perhaps serve as additional argument for the sophisticated discourse on mixed marriage in Hellenistic times.

8. Final Conclusions

Genesis 34 was developed as the paramount example for mixed marriage and its consequences in Jub. 30. The “rape” of Dinah in Gen 34 already bears witness to the polyphonic and manifold discourse on “Jewish” identity during the Persian Period which is closely linked to the notion of intermarriage as problematic. Although Israelite identity is constructed by the sharp distinction between Israelites and Gentiles, there is a “halakhic discourse” on the key markers of Israelite identity in the background of Gen 34. Especially the role of genealogy in determining identity is discussed by mentioning the circumcision and with it the question of conversion. Furthermore, Gen 34 provides contexts in which mixed marriages are at least implicitly considered acceptable. But still its concluding appraisal is definitive: in its final form Gen 34 represents a firmly disclaiming attitude towards interethnic marriages, insofar as the position of Simeon and Levi is de facto established—though not explicitly grounded in the narrative itself. The position is comparable to the absolute refusal of intermarriage in Num 25 or Ezra 10. Other opinions, such as the permissive position which claims for preconditions (circumcision) or compensations, are represented but repudiated at the same moment. This made Gen 34 a paramount example for the Hellenistic absolute refusal of intermarriage.

⁶¹. For the possible meanings of ἄρχων in the Ptolemaic context of the Septuagint, see recently Büchner, “You Shall Not Give,” 189–96.
Using the example of the reception of Gen 34 in *Jub.* 30, it has been revealed that the discourse on identity and therewith the abhorrence for the Gentiles was clearly intensified and sharpened in the Hellenistic Period. The book of *Jubilees* opts for separation and sharp demarcation, as was seen in the interpretation of *Jub.* 20–22. The demand for separation, which includes the rejection of mixed marriages, is ascribed to the testimonies of Abraham. This authorizing strategy of endogamy was of special importance for the general ban on intermarriage in *Jub.* 30. The chapter thus provides a total and radical rejection of intermarriages which is based on the pure/impure paradigm as well as on the holy/profane distinction. In generalizing, intensifying and applying Torah resp. the halakhic interpretations rooted in the Torah (especially in the book of Leviticus) and enlarging the requirements of the priestly caste to the whole people, the prohibition of intermarriages is understood as a ban on any sexual contact with Gentiles. It is possible that the lack discussion of the issue of sexual violence in *Jub.* 30 also reflects this extreme attitude: the circumstances leading to the sexual intercourse with a Gentile simply did not matter for the authors. In any case, and without exception, sexual contacts resp. mixed marriages are forbidden because they threaten Israel. The problem of such an extreme position is obvious. The examination of the patterns of justification in the book of *Jubilees* and the proposed suggestion to explain the recourse to Lev 20 have revealed that this total refusal of interethnic contacts and intermarriages has an outward anti-Hellenistic direction of impact which aims at the construction of a religious “Jewish” identity.