

YAKIR PAZ

From Scribes to Scholars

*Culture, Religion, and Politics
in the Greco-Roman World*

6

Mohr Siebeck

Culture, Religion, and Politics in the Greco-Roman World

Editors

Kendra Eshleman (Boston College), Teresa Morgan (University of Oxford),
Laura Nasrallah (Harvard University), Maren R. Niehoff (The Hebrew
University of Jerusalem), and Peter Van Nuffelen (Ghent University)

Advisory Board

Milette Gaifman (Yale University), Martha Himmelfarb (Princeton
University), Hayim Lapin (University of Maryland), Duncan MacRae
(University of California, Berkeley), Jörg Rüpke (Universität Erfurt),
Lieve Van Hoof (Ghent University)

6



Yakir Paz

From Scribes to Scholars

Rabbinic Biblical Exegesis in Light
of the Homeric Commentaries

Mohr Siebeck

Yakir Paz, born 1978; currently lecturer in the departments of Talmud and Classical Studies at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
orcid.org/0000-0001-8641-2839

ISBN 978-3-16-161630-3 / eISBN 978-3-16-161631-0

DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-161631-0

ISSN 2510-0785 / eISSN 2568-6623

(Culture, Religion, and Politics in the Greco-Roman World)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2022 Mohr Siebeck Tübingen, Germany. www.mohrsiebeck.com

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book printed on non-aging paper by Gulde Druck in Tübingen, and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

To my parents

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	XIII
Note on Editions, Translations, and Abbreviations	XV
Abbreviations	XVI
Introduction	1
<i>1. Midrash, Scrolls, and Homeric Scholarship</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>2. Survey of Scholarship</i>	<i>10</i>
2.1 Rabbinic Literature and the Homeric Commentaries	10
2.2 Homeric and Biblical Scholarship in Alexandria	17
2.3 Homeric Commentaries and Christian Biblical Commentaries	18
<i>3. The Present Study</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>4. Outline of the Book</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>5. Analogy vs. Genealogy</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>6. Sources</i>	<i>28</i>
6.1 Overview of the Homeric Commentaries	28
6.1.1 The A Scholia	33
6.1.2 The bT Scholia	34
6.1.3 The D Scholia	35
6.1.4 Scholia to the Odyssey	36
6.1.5 Papyri	36
6.1.6 Scholarship on the Homeric Commentaries	37
6.2 Halakhic Midrashim	38
Chapter 1: Source of Knowledge	41
<i>1. Introduction</i>	<i>41</i>
<i>2. Locus Classicus</i>	<i>43</i>

2.1	Topos Didaskalikos	43
2.2	I too Specify (אף פֿורט אַני)	48
2.3	Conclusion	52
3.	<i>Didactic Texts</i>	54
3.1	Introduction	54
3.2	Logos Paideutikos	56
3.2.1	Homer the Philhellen	56
3.2.2	Plutarch, “How to Study Poetry”	60
3.3	The Poet Teaches Us (διδάσκει ἡμᾶς ὁ ποιητής)	64
3.4	Philo: Moses the Educator	69
3.5	The Torah Teaches Proper Conduct	70
3.6	Conclusion	78
4.	<i>Re-Scripturizing</i>	80
4.1	Introduction	80
4.2	Re-Scripturizing in Homeric Scholarship	81
4.2.1	Mythological Dependence	82
4.2.2	Mis-Dependence	85
4.2.3	Literary Dependence	87
4.2.4	Philosophical Dependence	88
4.2.5	Dependence of Proverbs	88
4.2.6	Dependence of Ethical Maxims	89
4.2.7	Legal Dependence	90
4.3	Re-Scripturizing in the Halakhic Midrashim	91
4.3.1	Dependence of Ethical Maxims	93
4.3.2	Dependence of Proverbs	94
4.3.3	Legal Dependence	96
4.3.4	Dependence of the Mishna and other Edited Texts	97
4.4	Ideological Bibliographical Note	100
5.	<i>Conclusion</i>	101
Chapter 2: Justifying Redundancies		103
1.	<i>Introduction</i>	103
2.	<i>Repetitions</i>	105
2.1	Introduction	105
2.2	Double Tongues	109
2.2.1	The Paronomastic Infinitive in the Halakhic Midrashim	109
2.2.2	Internal Object in the Homeric Commentators and Philo	113

2.3 Duplication	120
2.3.1 “Man Man” in Halakhic Midrashim	120
2.3.2 Duplication in Rhetorical Handbooks	122
2.3.3 Philo on <i>anthrōpos anthrōpos</i>	124
2.4 Conclusion	125
3. <i>Synonyms</i>	128
3.1 Two Tongues	128
3.2 Synonyms in Homeric Commentaries	130
3.3 Philo on Synonyms	132
4. <i>Transition Formulae</i>	137
4.1 Metabasis	138
4.2 The Verse Transfers It	142
4.3 Separating the Matter	143
4.4 As a Seal of the Matter	148
4.5 Conclusion	150
5. <i>Isolating Particles</i>	151
5.1 Particles in the Early Homeric Commentaries	152
5.2 Particles in the Grammatical Treatises	153
5.3 Particles in Rabbinic Literature	155
5.3.1 Raq – Separated the Matter	157
5.3.2 Akh – Divided	162
5.3.3 Etim, Gamin, Akhim and Raqim	163
6. <i>Conclusion</i>	165
Chapter 3: Questions and Answers	167
1. <i>Introduction</i>	167
2. <i>Whence Does He Know?</i>	172
2.1 Whence Does He Know? (πόθεν οἶδεν;)	172
2.2 Whence Did He Know? (מניין היה יודע?)	179
3. <i>Whence Does He Have?</i>	184
3.1 Whence Does He Have? (πόθεν αὐτῷ;)	184
3.2 Whence Did He Have? (מניין היה לו?)	187
4. <i>Questions of Consideration</i>	190
4.1 Why Did He Not? (διὰ τί ... οὐκ;)	190

4.2 Why Did He Not? (מפני מה לא?)	193
5. <i>Why Character X and not Character Y?</i>	196
6. <i>Verisimilitude</i>	198
6.1 Impossibilities (ἀδύνατα)	199
6.2 How is it Possible? (היאך יכול)	204
7. <i>Contradictions</i>	207
7.1 Opposing Verses (τὰ μαχόμενα)	207
7.2 Two Verses Which Refute One Another	216
8. <i>Conclusion</i>	223
<i>Appendix: Hyperboles</i>	227
Chapter 4: Ambiguities	229
1. <i>Introduction</i>	229
2. <i>The Matter is Balanced</i>	231
2.1 Introduction	231
2.2 Amphibolia	232
2.3 And We Do Not Know	237
2.4 Conclusion	244
3. <i>Going Both Ways</i>	245
3.1 Nicanor and Consigning Words to Both Sides	246
3.2 Issi b. Yehuda and Unadjudicated Verses	254
3.3 Nicanor and Issi b. Yehuda	267
4. <i>Conclusion</i>	269
<i>Appendix: Prosody</i>	270
Chapter 5: Order and Disorder	273
1. <i>Introduction</i>	273
2. <i>Hyperbaton</i>	274
2.1 The Rhetorical Use of the hyperbaton	274
2.2 Hyperbaton in the Derveni Papyrus	276

2.3 Hyperbaton in Plato, Protagoras	278
2.4 Hyperbaton in Homeric Commentaries	279
2.5 Hyperbaton in Philo and Christian Commentators	284
3. <i>Order (τάξις)</i>	286
4. <i>Sares</i>	288
5. <i>According to the Order (ἄνωγ ἐπὶ)</i>	294
6. <i>Conclusion</i>	297
<i>Appendix: Sares, Anastrophē, and Nestor's Cup</i>	301
Conclusion	307
Bibliography	315
Index of References	351

Acknowledgements

This book is a translation and thorough revision of my dissertation, submitted to the Hebrew University of Jerusalem in 2015.

First and foremost, I wish to thank both my supervisors: Prof. Maren Niehoff and Prof. Shlomo Naeh.

I owe my first encounter with the ancient Homeric scholarship to Maren Niehoff who also continuously emphasized in her studies and our discussions its great potential for shedding light on rabbinic literature. I am truly grateful for her untiring support and encouragement, as well as her many apt comments, at every stage of the long and winding road of writing this study.

Shlomo Naeh has guided me already in my MA Thesis and his erudite supervision and mentorship helped me forge my scholarly path. His astute and perceptive comments and insights significantly enriched this study.

I would also like to thank my friends and colleagues for their support, comments and critiques: Avishai Bar-Asher; Shraga Bar-On; Bar Belinitzky; Hillel Ben Sasson; Margalit Finkelberg; Steven Fraade; Yair Furstenberg; Uri Gabbai; Idan Gilo; Simcha Gross; Mikaela Hassan; Orit Malka; Yakov Mayer; Hanan Mazeh; Avinoam Naeh; Filippomaria Pontani; Assaf Rosen-Zvi; Ishai Rosen-Zvi; Sinai Rusinek; Francesca Schironi; Samuel Thorpe; Tzahi Weiss; Ynon Wigoda.

This study benefited from the generous support of the Azrieli Foundation.

Finally, I would like to thank my family for their endless support, especially my sister Osnat and my dear parents to whom I dedicate this book.

Note on Editions, Translations, and Abbreviations

The translations of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* follow Lattimore 1951 and 1967, but I have occasionally modified them to render the text more literal (and at times more awkward) in order to facilitate the understanding of the commentaries. Translations of the Hebrew Bible follow JPS, at times modified. Translations of Philo are based on Colson and Whitaker 1929–1968, unless noted otherwise.

All translations of the scholia are mine, unless stated otherwise.

Citations from rabbinic literature follow *Ma'agarim: The Historical Dictionary Project* (<http://maagarim.hebrew-academy.org.il/Pages/PMain.aspx>), unless stated otherwise. The references are based on the editions cited in the bibliography. I have noted textual variants only when necessary; in order to facilitate the reading, I have occasionally added punctuation and completed abbreviations.

Abbreviation of biblical books, Philo's treatises and mishnaic tractates follow the SBL guidelines.

In the citations of the scholia the following abbreviations are used: Ariston. = Aristonicus; Did. = Didymus; ex. = exegetical; Herod. = Herodianus; Nic. = Nicanor; pap. = papyrus; sch. = scholia.

Abbreviations

AFO	<i>Archiv für Orientforschung</i>
AJPh	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
ANRW	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt</i>
BNJ	<i>Brill's New Jacoby online</i> : https://referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/brill-s-new-jacoby
BNP	<i>Brill's New Pauly online</i> : http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/brill-s-new-pauly
CQ	<i>Classical Quarterly</i>
CPh	<i>Classical Philology</i>
DSD	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
RivFil	<i>Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica</i>
GRBS	<i>Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies</i>
HSCPh	<i>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology</i>
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
JAJ	<i>Journal of Ancient Judaism</i>
JJS	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
JNES	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
JQR	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
JR	<i>The Journal of Religion</i>
JSIS	<i>Jewish Studies, an Internet Journal</i> : http://www.biu.ac.il/JS/JSIJ
JSJ	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
JSQ	<i>Jewish Studies Quarterly</i>
JSS	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
LGGA	<i>Lexicon of Greek Grammarians of Antiquity</i> : https://referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/lexicon-of-greek-grammarians-of-antiquity
RAC	<i>Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum</i> , Stuttgart, 1941–
RB	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
RE	A. Pauly et al. (eds.), <i>Pauly's Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft: neue Bearbeitung</i> , Stuttgart 1894–1980
RechSR	<i>Recherches de science religieuse</i>
RQ	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
RRS	<i>Review of Rabbinic Judaism</i>
SPhA	<i>Studia Philonica Annual</i>
TAPhA	<i>Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association</i>
WCJS	<i>Proceedings of the World Congress of Jewish Studies</i>
ZPE	<i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</i>

Introduction

Ὅμηρος δὲ καὶ πρῶτος καὶ μέσος καὶ ὕστατος, παντὶ παιδὶ καὶ ἀνδρὶ καὶ γέροντι τοσοῦτον ἅφ' αὐτοῦ διδοὺς ὅσον ἕκαστος δύνανται λαβεῖν.

But Homer comes first and in the middle and last, in that he gives of himself to every boy and adult and old man just as much as each of them can take.

(Dio Chrysostom, *Discourse* 18)¹

In late antiquity, the Homeric poems and the Torah were identity-forming canonical texts in Hellenistic and Jewish cultures, respectively. Their immense impact manifested itself mainly in the pivotal and almost exclusive role they played in the *paideia*, in the wide sense of the term as it was translated by Roman scholars: *humanitas* – that is, the molding and perfecting of the human being.² These texts were at the center of the curriculum of both the novice student and the scholar, and were an important factor in forming social norms.³

In the opening of his treatise *Homeric Problems*, Heraclitus (ca. 100 CE) writes the following:⁴

Εὐθὺς γὰρ ἐκ πρώτης ἡλικίας τὰ νήπια τῶν ἀρτιμαθῶν παιδῶν διδασκαλία παρ' ἐκείνῳ τιθεῖται, καὶ μονοноῦκ ἐνεσπαργανωμένοι τοῖς ἔπεσιν αὐτοῦ καθαπερεὶ ποτίμῳ γάλακτι τὰς ψυχὰς ἐπάρδομεν· ἀρχομένῳ δ' ἐκάστῳ συμπαρέστηκε καὶ κατ' ὀλίγον ἀπανδρουμένῳ, τελείοις δ' ἐνακμάζει, καὶ κόρος οὐδὲ εἰς ἄχρι γήρωσ, ἀλλὰ παυσάμενοι διψῶμεν αὐτοῦ πάλιν· καὶ σχεδὸν ἐν πέρας Ὅμηρον παρ' ἀνθρώποις, ὃ καὶ τοῦ βίου.

¹ Dio Chrys. 18.8; tr. Cohoon 1939, p. 219.

² See Marrou 1956, pp. 98–99 who discusses the widening of the meaning of the term *paideia* in the Hellenistic period.

³ On the centrality of Homer in Greek education see Jaeger 1945, pp. 35–56; Marrou 1956, pp. 162–170; Verdenius 1970; Morgan 1998; Hock 2001; Cribiore 2001, pp. 194–197; Lambertson 2002 (on the role of Homeric allegory and rhetoric in education); Sluiter 1997; Sandnes 2009; Niehoff 2012b; Pontani 2011; 2012 (on the use of Homer by the grammarians). On the canonic status of Homer see Finkelberg 2003. On Jewish education in Late Antiquity and the centrality of the Torah see Hirshman 2009 (and detailed bibliography pp. 121–126); Safrai 1976; Aberbach 1982; Hezser 2000b, pp. 39–109; 2010; 2016; Schwabe 1950. On the role of canonical texts in the *paideia* of Late Antiquity see Stroumsa 2012. For a comparative study of the role of the text in education of Pagan, Christians, and Jews in antiquity see Snyder 2000. For a comparison of the status of Moses and Homer in antiquity see Alexander 1998; Hezser 2016.

⁴ Heracl. *Quaest. Hom.*, 1.5–7, pp. 2–3 (tr. Russell and Konstan).

From the very first age of life, the foolishness of infants just beginning to learn is nurtured on the teaching given in his school. One might almost say that his poems are our baby clothes, and we nourish our minds by draughts of his milk. He stands at our side as we each grow up and shares our youth as we gradually come to manhood; when we are mature, his presence within us is at its prime; and even in old age, we never weary of him. When we stop, we thirst to begin him again. In a word, the only end of Homer for human beings is the end of life.

A similar concept can be found in rabbinic literature. So, for example, in a *baraita* adduced to the end of the mishnaic tractate Qiddushin (4:14), R. Nehorai (second half of the second century CE) states:

רבי נהוראי אומר: מניח אני כל אומנות שבעולם ואיני מלמד את בני אלא תורה,
 שאדם אוכל משכרה בעולם הזה וקרן קיימת לעולם הבא.
 ושאר כל אומנות אינן כן כשאדם בא לידי חולי או לידי זקנה או לידי יסורין ואינו יכול לעסוק במלאכתו הרי הוא
 מת ברעב.
 אבל התורה אינה כן אלא משמרתו מכל רע בנערותו ונותנת לו אחרית ותקוה בזקנותו.
 בנערותו מה הוא אומר? "וקוי ה' יחליפו כח" (יש' מ 31).
 בזקנותו מהו אומר? "עוד ינובון בשיבה" (תה' צב 15).

R. Nehorai says: I would set aside all the crafts in the world and teach my son naught save the Torah, for a man enjoys the reward thereof in this world and its whole worth remains for the world to come. But with all other crafts it is not so; for when a man falls into sickness or old age or afflictions and cannot engage in his work, lo, he dies of hunger. But with the Torah it is not so; for it guards him from all evil while he is young, and in old age it grants him a future and a hope. Of his youth, what does it say? "They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength" (Is. 40:31). Of his old age what does it say? "They shall still bring forth fruit in old age" (Ps. 92:15).⁵

The difference between R. Nehorai's statement and that of Heraclitus reflects the essential gap between the attitude of Greek culture toward Homer and of Jewish culture toward the Torah: for Heraclitus the role of Homer ends when one dies, whereas for R. Nehorai the Torah leads man to the World to Come. Yet the similarity between the texts is no less important. R. Nehorai and Heraclitus agree about the centrality of the Torah and Homer in man's life and believe that their respective texts accompany man from youth through old age, adjusting themselves to the different periods of life.

The centrality of these texts and their undisputed canonical status led to the development of exegetical communities in which these texts were interpreted in a collective effort by dozens of scholars over hundreds of years. In the Alexandrian library from the third century BCE onwards, numerous scholars labored at editing the Homeric poems and interpreting them according to philological, rhetorical, grammatical, and literary criteria, especially from the school of Aristotle, while developing sophisticated hermeneutical tools and technical terms. This exegetical tradition continued to evolve during the first centuries of the Common Era throughout the Roman Empire and was later redacted over

⁵ Tr. Danby 1933, p. 329.

hundreds of years into a voluminous exegetical collection, following verse order, which has come down to us mainly through the scholia on the margins of Byzantine manuscripts.

Parallel to the exegetical efforts on the Greek side, dozens of rabbis dedicated themselves during the first centuries CE to interpreting the Torah, using a wide array of exegetical methods. These rabbis were divided into distinct exegetical schools, and their commentaries were collected and redacted during the third century CE into Midrashic compilations, known as the Halakhic Midrashim, which were organized as a line-by-line commentary displaying a rich terminological system. These Midrashim have exerted a crucial impact on the formation of the role of the exegete vis-à-vis the holy text and on exegetical methods in the Jewish culture down to present times.

The non-allegorical Homeric commentaries and the Halakhic Midrashim which have come down to us are vast and significant corpora. Yet to date they have barely been compared by scholars, despite the fact that the rabbis were active within a distinct Greco-Roman context, and that Saul Lieberman and David Daube have already noted similarities between a small number of methods used by the Homeric scholars and the rabbis.⁶ In light of this, the goal of this work is to systematically compare the two corpora for the first time. My argument is that it is possible to point to various ways in which the Greek commentaries deeply impacted the rabbis' exegetical approach. Moreover, I will argue that we cannot understand the very appearance of the edited Midrashic compilations and some of their core hermeneutical assumptions without a familiarity with the contemporaneous Homeric commentaries.

In addition to its influence on rabbinic terminology and exegetical techniques, I will demonstrate how Homeric scholarship – as a representative of the literary, rhetorical, linguistic, and didactic discourse of the time – impacted the rabbis' methods of organizing knowledge and their learning practices, as well as their very understanding of the concept of the canonical text and the role of the commentator. The rabbis, I will argue, were in many ways part of the exegetical world of their time. Furthermore, the comparison with the Homeric scholarship may also advance our understanding of the background to the development of the distinct approaches of the schools of R. Akiva and R. Yishmael.

The comparison between the two corpora, however, will not only reveal similarities, but will also enhance our understanding of the unique features in the rabbinic exegesis. Indeed, only by understanding how the rabbis adopted and adapted the hermeneutical principles and methods of Greek scholarship while incorporating them into a different exegetical system can we appreciate the novelty and uniqueness of the rabbinic project.

⁶ On Lieberman's and Daube's research, as well as later scholarship, see below.

1. Midrash, Scrolls, and Homeric Scholarship

One of the greatest enigmas in the study of rabbinic literature is the seemingly sudden appearance of a rich, fully-crystallized scholastic exegetical corpus, divided into different schools, comprised of the sayings of dozens of sages, and applying well-developed sophisticated hermeneutical techniques and a wide array of technical terms. Is this a product of a continuous evolutionary process; did it result from a “Big Bang” – a dramatic and sudden change during the relevant period; or was there perhaps some kind of combination of the two? In other words: what is the relation between the rabbinic Midrash and the Jewish biblical commentaries that preceded it?

The fact that almost nothing has survived from the literature of the Pharisees or from the non-allegorical Jewish-Hellenistic commentaries poses great difficulties in reconstructing the development of the Midrash. Various scholars have tried to locate the buds of the Midrash in inner-biblical commentary and in the Second Temple literature.⁷ Some of these studies have emphasized the similarities in common narrative expansions and legal traditions, and thus outlined an exegetical continuum.⁸ Others, as I shall discuss below, looked to Hellenistic culture for the Midrashic roots.

The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls significantly advanced the study of the ancient Jewish commentaries. Alongside the genre of rewritings of the Bible that does not explicitly disclose its exegetical thrust,⁹ the scrolls also include commentaries such as the *pesharim*,¹⁰ which follow the order of the verse, differentiate between verse and commentary, and contain the beginnings of technical terminology, at times even employing the term “Midrash.”¹¹ Many

⁷ See, e.g., Zeligman 1980; Vermes 1975a; Fishbane 1985; Shinan and Zakovitch 1986. For attempts to reconstruct early Jewish commentary see Goldberg 1981; Albeck 1969, pp. 84–93; Lieberman 1963, pp. 186–189; Urbach 1958; Brewer 1992 (who anachronistically projects later sources onto the Second Temple period).

⁸ See, e.g., Kugel 1998, who is one of the dominant scholars of the school which focuses mainly on shared traditions, which began with Ginsburg’s monumental project *The Legends of the Jews* (1913–1928).

⁹ See, e.g., Kugel 2009.

¹⁰ Most of the *pesharim* are dated to the end of the second-first centuries BCE. Some consist of a running commentary to the verse, where a citation of a verse is followed by such formulae as פשרו על or פשר הדבר. Most of the *pesharim* address prophetic texts giving them an actual or eschatological interpretation. The commentator is anonymous and authoritative. On the *pesharim* see Nizan 2009, Berrin 2005; Jassen 2012; Machila 2012; Goldman 2019, pp. 30–42.

¹¹ There is extensive scholarship on the hermeneutics and exegetical terminology in the scrolls. See, e.g., Fishbane 1973; Maier 1996 (general overview); Nizan 2009; Shemesh 2004; Elledge 2003; Bernstein 1994a; 1996; 1998; 2013 (collection of essays); Berrin 2005 (with bibliography), as well as references in the following note. Special scholarly attention has been given to the commentary known as *Peshar Genesis A* (4Q252), see Bernstein 1979; 1994b; Brock 1996; 2005; Werman and Shemesh 2011, pp. 54–55; Machila 2012.

scholars have sought to identify in this literature the “missing link” between the Bible and rabbinic Midrash.¹² Some have compared the terms used in the scrolls to those found in rabbinic literature,¹³ at times even trying to reconstruct the hermeneutical methods that supposedly lie at the basis of the commentaries of the scrolls and comparing them to the rabbinic *middot* (measures of interpretations).¹⁴ So, for example, Aaron Shemesh writes:

I do not claim that there is an actual literary connection between the formulae in the scrolls and rabbinic midrash, but the comparison is important in order to show that already in the scrolls there are beginnings of fixed exegetical formulae also regarding Halakha, and these represent the first stages of the *middot* for commenting on the Torah.¹⁵

There can be no doubt that there are important common features between the exegetical methods of the authors of the scrolls and the rabbis. However, there are also crucial differences. First, unlike the scrolls, the Halakhic Midrashim do not present their commentary as the sole and unequivocal interpretation of a divinely-inspired authority, but rather as a commentary based on human efforts to resolve various difficulties in the biblical text.¹⁶ In addition, Steven Fraade has highlighted several central characteristics of the rabbinic Midrash that seem almost self-evident, but are almost never documented in the scrolls:¹⁷

¹² For a comparison between rabbinic and scroll commentaries see, e.g., Goldberg 1981; Werman and Shemesh 2011, pp. 51–71 (see p. 53 for a discussion of the term “Midrash” as representing a written treatise); Kugel 2009; Fraade 1991, pp. 1–23; 1998; 2005; 2006a; 2006b; 2007b; 2007c; Shemesh 2000; 2004; 2009; Kister 1998; 1999 (esp. pp. 332–335); Bernstein 1996; Bernstein and Koyfman 2005; Mandel 2001; 2006; 2017; Milgrom 1989; Brock 1985; 2000; 2009; Heger 2005; 2011; Shiffman 2005; Schremer 2001; Milikowsky 2013, vol. 1, pp. 61–62 and notes on pp. 99–101.

¹³ For example, some have pointed out the similarity between the exegetical formula א ב ב אה (“for A is B”) found in the scrolls and the rabbinic formula ב א א א א א א א (“A is nothing other than B”). See Werman and Shemesh 2011, p. 57. It is worth noting that Lieberman (1962, p. 49 n. 19) suggested that the rabbinic formula is equivalent to the Greek formula οὐδὲν ἄλλο Α ἢ Β. I have not, however, found use of the formula in the Homeric scholia.

¹⁴ Bernstein and Koyfman 2005, for example, sought to identify in the scroll the use of such *middot* as *qal va-homer* (*argumentum a fortiori*) and *biyan av* (prototype) alongside more general techniques such as harmonization and combining of verse. Cf. Milgrom 1989.

¹⁵ Werman and Shemesh 2011, p. 57 (my translation).

¹⁶ See, e.g., Fraade 1998 (and in many more articles; see note below); Heger 2005; Kahana 2006, p. 10. On the difference in the concept of authority in scrolls and Jewish Alexandrian commentary see Niehoff 2012c, pp. 456–457.

¹⁷ Fraade 2006c, p. 279. Fraade has often emphasized the fundamental differences between rabbinic commentaries and that found in the scrolls. See, e.g., idem 1991; 1998; 2006a; 2006b; 2007b. Kahana (2006, pp. 10–11) noted further differences between the scroll commentaries and the Halakhic Midrashim: The latter are written in Mishnaic Hebrew whereas the scrolls language is closer to Biblical Hebrew; the Halakhic regulations are much more detailed in the Halakhic Midrashim; in many cases the interpretation in the Halakhic Midrashim is further from the literal meaning of the verses.

(1) In the Midrash, numerous traditions are attributed to various named sages. In the scrolls, by contrast, no *specific* commentary is attributed to any individual, not even to the Teacher of Righteousness.¹⁸

(2) The sages explicitly point out the exegetical methods they use. That is, there is a reflexivity concerning the techniques used by the commentator. A wide range of technical terms present the exact method implemented in a given instance. In the scroll commentaries, on the other hand, the exegetical process is usually implicit. It is indeed possible that this process was based on various methods used during the teaching of the text.¹⁹ However, our interest lies in the textual product, and, as noted, we do not find in the scrolls an explicit use of the techniques, contrary to the rabbinic texts.

(3) Exegetical intertextuality is common in the Midrashim; that is, the creative use of a biblical verse from elsewhere in order to explain a given verse. This technique is relatively rare in the scrolls. This does not mean, as Fraade once again emphasizes, that in the background of these commentaries there was no use of intertextuality; but even if there was, it is not stated explicitly.²⁰

(4) The Midrashic discourse is dialogical and contains question and answers as well as rhetorical alternatives, which are absent from the scrolls.

(5) A distinct feature of rabbinic literature is the appearance of several interpretations for a single verse. In the scroll commentaries only one opinion is presented, whereas in the Halakhic Midrashim there are explicit disagreements between different sages from different generations within a single editorial framework.²¹

¹⁸ This is also an important difference between the rabbinic and Mesopotamian exegesis. As Frahm notes (2011, p. 377): “[T]he commentators in the Assyrian and Babylonian tradition always remain anonymous”.

¹⁹ According to Fraade, the sectarian authors systematically refrain from presenting the exegetical technique which led to the creation of a Halakha, even in cases where it is clear that such a technique was used. The reason for that, in his opinion, is ideological and stems from the belief that the source of the authority of the new halakhot is grounded in inspiration. Shemesh supports Fraade’s approach and notes: “Exposing the exegetical moves inherently acknowledges the possibility to offer other interpretations, and this is exactly what the writers of the scrolls seek to avoid” (Werman and Shemesh 2011, p. 64, my translation). The few cases in which the writers of the scrolls reveal their exegetical logic are found in polemical contexts (ibid.).

²⁰ Fraade 2006c, pp. 270, 279.

²¹ Scholars have debated the significance of multiple interpretations in rabbinic literature (i.e., whether it should be understood as polysemy, indeterminacy, pluralism etc.). See, e.g., Stern 1984; 1985; 1996; Handelman 1985; Mack 1992; Boyarin 2002; 2004, pp. 151-201; Yadin 2003; 2004, pp. 69-76; 2014; Fraade 2007a; Hiday 2010a. For the possibility that already in Peshar Habakkuk (1:16–2:10) three distinct interpretations are offered to Hab. 1:5; see Weigold 2012, who discusses other cases from Second Temple literature which possibly contain multiple interpretations. Philo at times offers additional interpretations, but that is part of

These differences might seem at first to be merely external and technical. Yet, in fact, they represent a paradigmatic change in the concept of the text and the role of the commentator: the human commentators are external to the commented texts.

How can we explain these differences? One possibility is that they are the result of chronological and evolutionary processes.²² Between the Dead Sea Scrolls and rabbinic literature there is a temporal gap of at least two hundred years. During this “dark” period, Jewish commentaries might have evolved so that they began to approach the rabbinic model. In other words, it is possible that the rabbinic Midrash is the end product of an exegetical development whose inception may be discerned in the scrolls.

In his studies, Menachem Kister has highlighted the continuum between the Qumran commentaries and those of the rabbis, suggesting that some of the differences are anchored in the gradual transition from the biblical to the post-biblical period.²³ In addition, the period between the composition of the scrolls and the appearance of rabbinic literature also included some momentous historical events that might have also impacted the commentaries. So, for example, Kister argues that some of the differences between Qumran and the rabbis are a result of the failure of the revolts, which created a shift from an impending sense of eschatology to a suspended one, impacting the exegetical goals.²⁴

Another significant development that occurred between the writing of the scrolls and the appearance of the Halakhic Midrashim was the full canonization of the biblical literature. The fact that it was no longer possible to add books, or even to change the version of the verses, created the need for works that distinguished between the commentators and the canonized text. Moreover, canonization deeply impacts the exegetical methods, as Moshe Halbertal has noted:²⁵ “Canonizing a text results in increased flexibility in its interpretation,

his authoritative presentation (see Fraade 1991, p. 16). In the homily of Samson of Ps.-Philo (*de Sam.* 21) the author offers several interpretations and rejects them.

²² Fraade 2006c, p. 281.

²³ Kister 1998. See Werman and Shemesh 2011, pp. 63–64 for a comparison between the approaches of Kister and Fraade.

²⁴ Kister 1998, p. 103 n. 9.

²⁵ Halbertal 1997, pp. 32–33. See also p. 29: “The degree of canonicity of a text corresponds to the amount of charity it receives in its interpretation. The more canonical a text, the more generous its treatment.” For an implementation of these insights to the Homeric corpus see Finkelberg 2004, p. 241 (cf. eadem 2003, p. 92): “In the centuries that followed, the tendency to avoid altering the received text of Homer became the dominant one. What was offered instead were various methods of interpretation. To borrow the terms introduced by Moshe Halbertal in his discussion of the reception of the Hebrew Bible, “textual closure” of the Homeric corpus was accompanied by “hermeneutical openness” towards it – a sure sign of the canonical status that the poems of Homer had acquired.”

such as the use of complex hermeneutical devices of accommodation to yield the best possible reading.”

These explanations emphasize the continuity between the exegetical communities of Qumran and the rabbis. Another direction is to underscore the ideological differences between the two communities. According to Fraade, it is possible to explain some of the differences by assuming a different social structure with differing concepts of authority.²⁶ The formation of a rabbinic scholarly community that did not have a single authority, such as the Teacher of Righteousness, enabled the development of a dialogical literature. Menahem Kahana has suggested that the effort to confront opinions that undermined the Pharisaic Halakha motivated the creation of Halakhic Midrashim, at the center of which lies the effort to connect the Halakha to the verses. Kahana further suggested that the accumulation of Halakhic details which had no foundation in the literal sense of the verses, and the growing rift between the biblical law and the Pharisaic Halakha, alongside internal polemics between the different schools, may also provide a reason for the formation of the Halakhic Midrashim.²⁷

All these explanations are possible and, moreover, are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Yet they explain in different ways the possibility for change, but do not provide a sufficient answer as to why the Halakhic Midrashim were formed in this very specific mold.²⁸

A preliminary overview of the Homeric commentaries, which are the product of the intellectual effort of generations of scholars, reveals that all five of the distinctive features of rabbinic commentary mentioned above also appear in these texts:

(1) The opinions of the scholars are very often cited with their names. So, for example, hundreds of comments state *φησὶν Ἀρίσταρχος* (“Aristarchus says”).

(2) The Homeric commentaries are transparent and reflexive. The commentators usually note their hermeneutical methods, employing a wide array of technical terms.

²⁶ See, e.g., Fraade 2006c, p. 283. Cf. Mandel 2001, pp. 167–168: “[T]he tool used by the Qumran sect, and by the early Christians, of reading the Bible as a treasure of hidden historical references may be seen as a major incentive to the rabbis’ peculiar reading of Scripture. The authority of the *doresh ha-Torah* at Qumran, understood to come directly from divine inspiration, was transmuted into the authority of the rabbinic *doresh*, who found his inspiration ultimately in the text itself.”

²⁷ Kahana 2006, 11. See also Schremer 2001.

²⁸ See, e.g., Fraade 2006a; 2006b; 1991, pp. 1–19.

(3) The Homeric scholars frequently use intertextuality as an exegetical tool. They often use citations from Homer and other authors in order to clarify obscure verses. Aristarchus was even credited with the rule “to clarify Homer from Homer”.²⁹

(4) The Homeric scholarship contains hundreds of questions and answers reflecting a lively dialogue between scholars. It also includes direct references to the reader and the student.³⁰

(5) A common phenomenon in the Homeric scholarship is the multiplicity of comments on the same words or verses. The editors of the exegetical compilations collected the opinions of various scholars from different periods, sometimes hundreds of years apart. Occasionally the names of the scholars are not stated explicitly and the various opinions are introduced by such terms as ἔνιοι/τινές φασίν (“some say”) and ἄλλοι φησίν (“others say”), identical to the rabbinic editorial terms יש אומרים (“some say”) and אחרים אומרים (“others say”), respectively.³¹ Alternative opinions taken from separate sources are usually introduced in the scholia by the technical term ἄλλως (“in another way”), equivalent to דבר אחר (*davar aher*, “another way”).³²

This clear similarity between the scholarly product of the Greek scholars and the rabbis justifies and enables a deeper and more comprehensive comparison than previously conducted. It points to the possibility that the essential differences between rabbinic exegesis and the earlier Jewish exegesis may be

²⁹ For a discussion of this rule see Chapter 1 Section 2.1.

³⁰ For a comprehensive discussion on the genre of questions and answers see Chapter 3. On the difference between the scrolls and rabbinic literature in this context see Niehoff 2012c, pp. 457–458. Van der Valk 1963–1964, vol. 1, p. 474, points to the direct addresses to the reader or student in the bT scholia by the common use of interjections such as ὄρα and σκόπει and suggests that this may reflect oral instruction.

³¹ On the use of the term אחרים אומרים in Tannaitic literature see Kahana 1999, pp. 334–335; Epstein 2010, p. 19 n. 1. In b. Hor. 13b it is suggested that this term refers to R. Meir.

³² On *davar aher* see Goldberg 1982. Dating the beginning of the use of ἄλλως (and *aliter*) as a technical term for marking a transition to another source is highly important for dating the rise of scholiography. For a comprehensive discussion see Montana 2011. Previous scholars argued that this is a byzantine development influenced by the emergence of the catena, see Zunz 1975; Wilson 1967; 1968 (who even suggested that the term which appears in the catena of Procopius was influenced by Talmudic literature). In Mesopotamian commentaries, consecutive interpretations are marked by the terms *šanīš* (second), *šālšīš* (thirdly), *rebīš* (fourthly). Uri Gabbay (2015b; 2012, pp. 308–309 n. 128) has suggested that the term *šanīš* should be translated as ‘other’ and that originally it was used as a general term for introducing an alternative interpretation and not necessarily a second one (*šālšīš* and *rebīš* were therefore introduced only later). Furthermore, it is likely that the term designated the use of another source and not just another interpretation suggested by the same authority. In light of this, Gabbay suggests that the terms *šanīš* and דבר אחר are parallels not only in their scholarly role but also lexically (cf. Frahm 2011, p. 378, n. 1812). I will address the relation between the scholastic terms *šanīš*, ἄλλως, *aliter* and דבר אחר in a future study.

explained in part by the rabbis' direct or indirect acquaintance with contemporary Hellenistic scholarship.³³

2. Survey of Scholarship

2.1 Rabbinic Literature and the Homeric Commentaries

Many studies have dealt with comparisons between various aspects of Hellenistic culture and rabbinic literature, as well as the impact of Greek on rabbinic Hebrew and Aramaic.³⁴ In the context of the present study, it is important to note those studies that have focused on the impact of Hellenistic rhetoric on the form and content of the rabbinic *derashot*, and in particular on the *chreia* (χρηία), diatribe, and the *progymnasmata* literature.³⁵ Yet surprisingly there are almost no studies offering a comparison between rabbinic and Hellenistic commentaries, despite the centrality of biblical exegesis for the rabbis and the large corpus of Homeric scholarship that has survived. The main studies dedicated to this comparison remain those of David Daube and Saul Lieberman, written over sixty years ago. Since scholars have cited and referred to these studies dozens of times, I shall now review them in detail.

In his groundbreaking 1949 article “Rabbinic Methods of Interpretation and the Hellenistic Rhetoric,” Daube argued that “in its beginnings, the Rabbinic

³³ See, e.g., Niehoff 2012c, p. 445: “[T]he scholarly form of commentary culture, known in the Land of Israel from rabbinic sources, seems to have developed as a result of active engagement with Hellenistic culture.”

³⁴ For a general overview of Greco-Roman culture and the rabbis see Schäfer 1998; Levine 1998; Lieberman 1962; 1965; Hidary 2022. For studies on the impact of Greek on Hebrew and Aramaic of the rabbinic literature see Lieberman 1963; 1965; 1991; Rosen 1963; Sperber 2006. On Greek and Latin loanwords in rabbinic literature see Krauss 1898 and the review of Zunz 1956; Sperber 1982; 1984 (and review by Katzoff 1989); Sperber 1986; 2012; Hirshman 2010 and the review by Bar Kokhva 2013; Krivoruchko 2012; Heijmans 2013; Shoval-Dudai 2019. For the impact of Greek philosophy on the rabbis see, e.g., Goldin 1973; Fischel 1973a; 1973b; 2000a; Harvey 1992; Satlow 2003; Niehoff 2022. For the literary impact of the Greek novel see, e.g., Levinson 1996; Stern 1998. See also Kovelman 2004; Boyarin 2009 for the possible impact of Menippean satire. For a comparison between etymological methods used by the rabbis and Hellenistic scholars see Alexander 2004; Zingerman 2011. For an approach which minimizes the impact of Hellenistic culture and language on the rabbis see Alon 1970; Feldman 1983; Wasserstein 1994.

³⁵ For the impact of Greek rhetorical models and *progymnasmata* on rabbinic literature see Marmorstein 1929; Bickerman 1952; Fischel 1973a; Jaffee 1988; Ulman 1997 (on the diatribe); Visotzky 2006, pp. 120–126; Furstenberg 2012 (on the *agon*); Brodsky 2014; Hidary 2010b; 2018a; 2018b. On the impact of the *chreia* genre see Edelman 1961; Fischel 1968; 1969; 1973a; 1975; Avery-Peck 1993; Hezser 1996; Tropper 2004, pp. 174–184.

Index of References

Bible

Genesis

2:17	116
3:9	271
4:5	183
4:7	254, 262–265
5:32	241–242
6:10	241 n. 25
7:6	241
7:11	241
10:1	241 n. 25
10:11	241
10:12	244 n. 42
10:21	240–241, 244 n. 42
11:10	240–241
12:10	156
13:16	228
17:13	111, 112 n. 25, 118–119
19:33	188
21:12	244 n. 42
22:11	124
25:29	114
26:4	228
26:32	244 n. 42
28:15	296
28:20–21	296–297
31:20	111–112
34:7	255, 258–259
37:15	238
37:36	198
40:15	111–112
46:2	124
47:17–18	69
49:6–7	254–255, 260–261

Exodus

4:3	195–196
5:3	187
6:3	284
6:25	198
6:26	292
12:1	292
12:3	96
12:16	157
12:45	121
13:18	187 n. 57
13:19	180–181
14:6–7	178
14:22	272
14:29	272
14:30	187
15:1	156 n. 159
15:9	180
15:20	187–188
15:21	71 n. 107
15:25	74 n. 116
15:27	156
15:30	110
16:19	290
16:20	290
16:24	290
17:3	94
17:8–13	187
17:9	74, 254–255, 257–258
17:13	187
18:6	94
18:7	94, 237–238
18:12	71–72
19:3	156 n. 160
19:8	75–76
19:9	118

19:14	74 n. 117	23:40	51 n. 38
20:21	156 n. 158, 288–289	25:30	243 n. 38
21:5	112 n. 25	25:37–8	93
21:8	243 n. 38		
21:12	114–115	<i>Numbers</i>	
21:18–19	49	3:1	217–218
21:19	112 n. 25	3:2	218
21:28–29	50	4:3	218
22:7	150 n. 138	4:23	218 n. 130, 219
22:8	150 n. 138	4:30	218 n. 130
22:12	50–51	4:35	218 n. 130
22:20	93	4:39	218 n. 130
22:21–22	117	4:43	218 n. 130
23:24	118 n. 47	4:47	218 n. 130
24:7	108	5:29	149
25:34	254–255, 259–260	6:1–8	142
26:10	288 n. 49	6:2	118
29:2	52	6:3	128–9, 135, 137
31:13	162	6:5	143
32:32	264	6:6	143
37:20	254–255, 259–260	6:23	288
		6:27	288
<i>Leviticus</i>		8:24	219
2:14	148 n. 133	11:27	181
4:25	268 n. 112	11:28	74–75
6:2	145 n. 128	12:1	181
6:7	145 n. 128	12:3	94, 237–239
6:13	52 n. 41	12:4–5	193–194
6:18	145 n. 128	12:11	74–75
7:1	145 n. 128	12:13	73, 193
7:11	145 n. 128	15:19	156 n. 162
9:20	121 n. 55	15:30–1	109–110
9:22	290	15:31	114 n. 35
10:9	130, 135, 137	19:6	51 n. 37
11:32	156 n. 164	19:14	145 n. 128
14:4	51 n. 36	27:2	291
16:23	294–295	27:17	195
16:23–25	295–296	27:18	195
16:34	294	28:5	52
18:6	124	28:7	135 n. 97
18:21	243 n. 38	29:39–30:3	146–147
19:9	98	30:1	146
19:23	246	31:6	197
19:24	96	31:16	254–255
19:32	254 n. 64	31:17–18	147–148
21:9	151	33:46–47	156
22:4	120–1		
22:10	121		

<i>Deuteronomy</i>		21:8	217–218
3:26	95	24:22	221–222
4:24	204–205		
6:13	163	<i>1 Kings</i>	
7:6	239–240	8:9	157–159
9:1	228	8:10	243 n. 38
10:20	163		
11:26	264	<i>2 Kings</i>	
12:2	112 n. 25	4:14	156
13:2	129 n. 77, 130	24:8	220
14:2	240 n. 23		
14:26	135 n. 97	<i>Isaiah</i>	
14:29	98	5:11	135 n. 97
15:14	112 n. 25, 114 n. 35	5:22	135 n. 97
17:6	115 n. 39	6:1	244 n. 42
22:1	112 n. 25, 114 n. 35	9:2	243 n. 38
22:7	112 n. 25, 114 n. 35	24:9	135 n. 97
22:22	163	28:7	135 n. 97
30:20	204–205	29:9	135 n. 97
31:16	254–255, 265–266	40:31	2
32:8–9	239 n. 22	58:9	193
32:14	205–206	63:9	243 n. 38
32:42	204–205		
33:13	132 n. 87	<i>Jeremiah</i>	
		10:16	239–240
<i>Joshua</i>		<i>Ezekiel</i>	
2:16	180	8:3	156
11:22	157–158		
		<i>Hosea</i>	
<i>Judges</i>		12:5	244 n. 42
8:4	238		
13:4	135 n. 97	<i>Joel</i>	
13:7	135 n. 97	4:18	188–189
13:14	135 n. 97		
		<i>Micah</i>	
<i>1 Samuel</i>		2:11	135 n. 97
1:11	135 n. 97, 136 n. 99		
1:15	135 n. 97, 136 n. 99	<i>Habakkuk</i>	
2:3	244 n. 42	1:5	6 n. 21
2:15	243 n. 38		
3:10	124	<i>Psalms</i>	
		68:19	205
<i>2 Samuel</i>		92:15	2
6:23	217–218	135:4	239–240, 244 n. 42
16:18	243 n. 38		
17:24	156	<i>Proverbs</i>	
17:27	156	19:7	243 n. 38
19:7	243 n. 38		

26:2	243 n. 38	<i>1 Chronicles</i>	
		1:28	228
<i>Job</i>		5:9	156
1:8	242–243	21:25	221–222
6:21	243 n. 38		
13:15	242, 244 n. 42	<i>2 Chronicles</i>	
14:19	244 n. 42	36:9	220
22:28	193		
25:2–3	219	<i>Ben Sira</i>	
27:5	242	50:20	291 n. 54
41:4	243 n. 38		
		<i>Luke</i>	
<i>Ruth</i>		1:15	135 n. 97
4:17	217–218	1:26–27	285
		<i>Romans</i>	
<i>Daniel</i>		1:13–15	285 n. 38
7:9	204–205		
7:10	210	<i>Ephesians</i>	
		1:15–17	285 n. 38

Biblical Translations

Aquila		Gen. 10:21	241
Gen. 4:7	262	Ex. 37:20	260
Gen. 10:21	241		
Isa. 28:7	135 n. 97	<i>Peshitta</i>	
		Gen. 4:7	262–263
Fragment Targum V		Gen. 34:7	259
Gen. 49:6–7	261	Gen. 49:6–7	261
		Ex. 17:9	258
Fragment Targum Geniza		Ex. 37:20	259–260
Gen. 49:6–7	261 n. 93	1 Chr. 21:25	221
		2 Chr. 36:8	221
<i>Neofiti</i>		<i>Samaritan Pentateuch</i>	
Gen. 4:7	262	Ex. 18:7	238
Gen. 34:7	259		
Gen. 49:6–7	261 n. 93	<i>Samaritan Targum</i>	
		Gen. 34:7	259
<i>Onqelos</i>		Gen. 49:6–7	261 n. 92
Gen. 4:7	262	Ex. 17:9	258 n. 80
Gen. 34:7	259	Ex. 25:34	259 n. 86
Gen. 49:6–7	261	Ex. 37:20	259 n. 86
<i>Origen</i>		<i>Septuagint</i>	
<i>Hexap.</i>		Gen. 2:17	116
Gen. 4:7	262		

Gen. 3:9	271	Isa. 28:7	135 n. 97
Gen. 10:21	241 n. 30	Isa. 29:9	135 n. 97
Gen. 17:13	118–119	Mic. 2:11	135 n. 97
Gen. 25:29	114	2 Chr. 36:9	221
Gen. 34:7	259		
Gen. 47:17–18	69	Symmachus	
Ex. 6:3	284	Gen. 4:7	262
Ex. 13:18	187 n. 57	Gen. 10:21	241
Ex. 17:9	258	Isa. 28:7	135 n. 97
Ex. 19:9	118		
Ex. 21:12	114–115	Targum Jonathan	
Ex. 22:21–22	117	2 Sam. 21:8	218 n. 129
Ex. 25:34	260 n. 88		
Lev. 10:9	135, 137	Targum Ps.–Jonathan	
Lev. 18:6	124	Gen. 4:7	262
Num. 6:2	118	Gen. 10:21	242
Num. 6:3	135, 137	Gen. 34:7	259
Num. 15:31	114 n. 35	Gen. 49:6–7	261 n. 93
Num. 28:7	135 n. 97	Ex. 25:34	260 n. 86
Deut. 14:26	135 n. 97	Ex. 37:20	260 n. 86
Deut. 15:14	114 n. 35		
Deut. 22:1	114 n. 35	Theodotion	
Deut. 22:7	114 n. 35	Gen. 4:7	262
Judg. 13:4	135 n. 97	Isa. 28:7	135 n. 97
Judg. 13:7	135 n. 97		
Judg. 13:14	135 n. 97	Vulgate	
1 Sam. 1:11	135 n. 97, 136 n. 99	Gen 10:21	241
1 Sam. 1:15	135 n. 97, 136 n. 99		
Isa. 5:11	135 n. 97	4QSam ^a	
Isa. 5:22	135 n. 97	1:21	135 n. 97
Isa. 24:9	135 n. 97		

Rabbinic Literature

Abot d'R. Natan B		<i>b. B. Metzia</i>	
44 62a	254 n. 65	31a	112 n. 25
		31b	122 n. 57
Babylonian Talmud			
<i>b. Arak.</i>		<i>b. Bek.</i>	
3a	122 n. 57	5b	162 n. 180
<i>b. B. Bat.</i>		<i>b. Ber.</i>	
14a	158	10a	233 n. 6
109b	198, n. 78		
<i>b. B. Qam.</i>		<i>b. Erub.</i>	
92a–b	95 n. 185	101a	233 n. 6

- | | | | |
|------------------|------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <i>b. Hor.</i> | | <i>b. Shabb.</i> | |
| 13b | 9 n. 31 | 22a | 239 n. 21 |
| | | 26a | 49 n. 29 |
| <i>b. Git.</i> | | 27a | 156 n. 164 |
| 41b | 122 n. 57 | <i>b. Sotah</i> | |
| 57a | 11 | 13b | 95 n. 184 |
| <i>b. Hul.</i> | | 29b | 233 n. 6 |
| 87a | 233 n. 6 | 43a | 198, n. 78 |
| 90b | 228 n. 150 | <i>b. Sukkah</i> | |
| 92a | 244 n. 42 | 52b | 233 n. 6 |
| <i>b. Ker.</i> | | <i>b. Tamid</i> | |
| 11a | 122 n. 57 | 29a | 228 n. 150 |
| <i>b. Ketub.</i> | | <i>b. Yebam.</i> | |
| 67a | 95 n. 184 | 4b | 49 n. 29 |
| 67b | 122 n. 57 | 13b | 156 |
| 104a | 95 n. 184 | <i>b. Yoma</i> | |
| <i>b. Menah.</i> | | 10a | 244 n. 42 |
| 29b | 145 n. 128 | 52a–b | 254 n. 65, 255, 257, 263
n. 102 |
| <i>b. Ned.</i> | | 71b | 11 |
| 3a | 119 n. 50 | 85b | 162 n. 180 |
| <i>b. Nid.</i> | | <i>b. Zebah.</i> | |
| 32b | 122 n. 57 | 108b | 122 n. 57 |
| 44a | 122 n. 57 | Baraita of Melekheth Mishkan | |
| <i>b. Qidd.</i> | | 10, pp. 193–194 | 254 n. 65 |
| 17a | 122 n. 57 | Baraita of 32 Middot | |
| 32b | 254 n. 64 | 31, p. 39 | 293 n. 62, 299 n. 71 |
| 37b | 49 n. 29 | <i>Ecclesiastes Rabba</i> | |
| 78b | 293 n. 62 | 9:10, p. 196 | 293 n. 62 |
| <i>b. Sanh.</i> | | <i>Exodus Rabba</i> | |
| 19b | 218 | 7.1 | 196 n. 73 |
| 34b | 156 n. 164 | 7.5 | 198, n. 78 |
| 51b | 151–152 | <i>Genesis Rabba</i> | |
| 56a | 122 n. 57 | 1.14, p. 12 | 163 n. 183 |
| 69b | 242 | 8.9, p. 63 | 233 n. 6 |
| 82a | 198, n. 77 | 16.3, p. 145 | 95 n. 185 |
| 85b | 122 n. 57 | 19.1, p. 170 | 95 n. 184 |
| 90b | 266 | | |
| 108b | 242 n. 35 | | |
| <i>b. Shevu.</i> | | | |
| 26a | 163 n. 183 | | |

- 22.6, p. 209 183 n. 48
 22.6, pp. 209–210 265 n. 107
 26.3, pp. 245–246 242
 33.1, pp. 299–300 293 n. 62, 294 n. 64
 36.6, p. 340 168
 37.4, p. 347 244 n. 42
 37.7, p. 349 240–241
 39.8, p. 369 195 n. 71
 39.8, p. 370 195 n. 71
 44.5, p. 428 156 n. 165
 51.8, p. 538 188–189
 64.10, p. 712 243 n. 38, 244 n. 42
 70.4, pp. 800–801 296
 80.6, pp. 957–958 254 n. 65, 255 n. 67
 86.2, p. 1053 156 n. 168
- Kallah Rabbati**
 2:13 95 n. 184
- Leviticus Rabba**
 22.1, p. 531 293 n. 62
 33.4, pp. 761–762 198, n. 77
- Mekhilta Deuteronomy**
 11:29, 130 180 n. 39
 12:7, p. 192 292 n. 57
 12:12, p. 58 112 n. 25
- Mekhilta of R. Shimon b. Yohai**
 3:8, p. 2 196 n. 73
 12:14, p. 16 239 n. 21
 12:16, p. 20 157
 12:30, p. 29 48 n. 28
 12:31, p. 29 164 n. 184
 13:19, p. 46 181 n. 41
 14:6, p. 52 179 n. 36
 16:15, p. 111 95 n. 182
 17:3, p. 117 94
 17:9, p. 121 254 n. 65, 258 n. 81
 18:7, p. 130 94, 237 n. 19
 19:8, p. 140 76 n. 122
 21:5, p. 162 112 n. 25
 22:22, p. 211 117
- Mekhilta of R. Yishmael**
Amalek
 1, p. 176 74
- 1, p. 179 254–255, 257, 264 n. 104
 2, p. 182 156 n. 161
 1, p. 189 198 n. 77
 1, p. 192 237 n. 19
 1, p. 193 94 n. 179, 237–238
 1, p. 196 72, 77
- Ba-Hodesh*
 2, p. 207 156 n. 160
 2, p. 209–210 76
 3, p. 213 74 n. 117, 233 n. 6
 8, p. 232 292 n. 57
 9, p. 238 156 n. 160, 216 n. 124
 11, p. 243 156 n. 158
 11, p. 244 93 n. 177
- Be-Shalach*
 p. 76 93 n. 177
 p. 78 180–181
 p. 82 205 n. 97
 1, pp. 89–90 179
 6, pp. 111–112 272
- Kaspa*
 19, p. 315 156 n. 158
 20, pp. 335–336 150 n. 138
- Neziqin*
 2, p. 252 112 n. 25
 6, p. 269 49
 6, p. 271 112 n. 25
 7, p. 274 162 n. 180
 15, p. 302 150 n. 138
 18, p. 311 93
 18, p. 313 117
- Pischa*
 1, p. 1 292
 1, pp. 1–2 292 n. 57
 1, p. 6 156 n. 163
 3, p. 11 96, 148 n. 133
 4, p. 13 216 n. 124
 5, p. 17 97 n. 193, 148 n. 133
 7, p. 22 76 n. 122
 8, p. 28 162 n. 180
 9, p. 32 162 n. 180
 11, p. 37 51

- | | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| 14, p. 50 | 220 n. 133 | <i>m. Ber.</i> | |
| 15, p. 53 | 150 n. 140 | 1:3 | 112 n. 26 |
| 16, p. 62 | 268 n. 112 | 5:5 | 96 |
| <i>Shabta</i> | | | |
| 1, p. 341 | 162 | <i>m. Hul.</i> | |
| 1, p. 343 | 217 n. 128 | 12:3 | 112 n. 25 |
| <i>Shira</i> | | | |
| 1, p. 116 | 156 n. 159 | <i>m. Menah.</i> | |
| 2, p. 122 | 188–189 | 8:7 | 268 n. 112 |
| 2, p. 124 | 217 n. 128 | <i>m. Peah</i> | |
| 3, p. 126 | 156 n. 163 | 4:10 | 98 |
| 3, p. 127 | 205 n. 97 | 8:5 | 99 |
| 4, p. 131 | 205 n. 97 | <i>m. Qidd.</i> | |
| 5, p. 134 | 217 n. 128 | 4:14 | 2 |
| 7, p. 139 | 180 | <i>m. Sanh.</i> | |
| 10, p. 151 | 187–188 | 1:1 | 150 n. 138 |
| 10, p. 152 | 71 n. 107 | <i>m. Shabb.</i> | |
| <i>Va-Yasa</i> | | | |
| 1, p. 155 | 74 n. 116 | 8:5 | 149 n. 134 |
| 3, pp. 167–168 | 95 n. 182 | <i>m. Shev.</i> | |
| 4, p. 167 | 290, 298 | 3:2 | 120 n. 53 |
| 6, p. 174 | 94 n. 181 | 4:6 | 112 n. 26 |
| 6, p. 175 | 95 n. 182 | <i>m. Sotah</i> | |
| Midrash Lekach Tov | | | |
| Yitro 18 | 238 | 5:1 | 151 n. 143 |
| Midrash Psalms | | | |
| 18.9 70a | 289 n. 52, 293 n. 62 | 5:5 | 242–243 |
| Midrash Tannaim | | | |
| 14:2, p. 73 | 240 n. 23, 243 n. 38, | 7:4 | 268 n. 112 |
| 14:2, pp. 73–74 | 244 n. 42 | Palestinian Talmud | |
| 17:6, p. 101 | 115 n. 39 | <i>y. Avod. Zar.</i> | |
| Mishna | | | |
| <i>m. Avot</i> | | | |
| 4:12 | 75 | 2:5 41c–d | 254 n. 65, 255 |
| 5:22 | 41 | <i>y. Ber.</i> | |
| <i>m. B. Metzia</i> | | | |
| 2:9 | 112 n. 25 | 9:4 14c | 293 n. 62 |
| <i>m. B. Qama</i> | | | |
| 2:1 | 112 n. 26 | 9:5 14b | 163 |
| <i>y. Naz.</i> | | | |
| | | 7:2 56b | 293 n. 62 |
| <i>y. Ned.</i> | | | |
| | | 1:1 36c | 111 n. 24 |
| | | 6:1. 39c | 111 |
| <i>y. Or.</i> | | | |
| | | 1:2 60d | 129 n. 78 |

<i>y. Rosh. Hash.</i>		<i>Emor</i>	
2:9 58b	293 n. 62	3:2 95c	121 n. 54
3:5 58d	48 n. 28	4:2 97a	121
		7:1 98a	121 n. 54
<i>y. Shabb.</i>		12:3 102c	51 n. 39
19:2 17a	111 n. 24	14:2 104d	121 n. 54
<i>y. Sheqal.</i>		<i>Hova</i>	
1:6 46b	156 n. 163	3:1 17d	51 n. 39
8:2 51b	228 n. 150	6:3 21b	268 n. 112
		10:3 25a	52 n. 41
<i>y. Sotah</i>		<i>Metsora</i>	
5:5 20c	163 n. 183	1:1 70a	149 n. 136
8:2 22b	296 n. 69		
<i>y. Ta'an</i>		<i>Miluim</i>	
4:1 67b	290 n. 53	1:1 41a	294 n. 66
		1:2 43c	237 n. 19
<i>y. Yebam.</i>		1:2 45b	290
8:1 8d	111–112	1:2 46a	289
Pesiqta de Rav Kahana		<i>Nedava</i>	
1, p. 147	293 n. 62	2:1 3c	144
12, p. 236	198 n. 77	2:1 3d	124
		6:1 7c	144 n. 124
Seder Olam Rabba		14:1 12d	148 n. 133
1, p. 221	241	16:4 15a	144 n. 124
17, p. 273	205 n. 97, 220 n. 133		
25, p. 302	220 n. 133	<i>Qedoshim</i>	
25, p. 304	220–221	1:3 87d	98
		3:1 89c	122 n. 57
Sifra		4:1 90b	96
<i>Aharei Mot</i>		4:3 91a	86 n. 152
1:1 80a	48 n. 28	5:1 91b	121 n. 54
3:2 81c	233 n. 6	5:2 92a	121 nn. 54–55
4:3 82b	294–295		
5:1 82b	233 n. 6	<i>Sheratsim</i>	
5:3 83b	294	1:2 46b	130
6:1 83c	121 n. 54	6:1 53a	156 n. 164
6:3 84a–b	121 n. 54, 122 n. 57		
8:2 85d	121 n. 54	<i>Tsav</i>	
8:3 91d	121 nn. 54–5	2:1 30c	149 n. 136
		4:1 32a	149 n. 136
<i>Be-Har</i>		5:1 33c	149 n. 136
5:1 109c	93	6:1 34b	149 n. 136
<i>Be-Huqotai</i>		<i>Zavim</i>	
2:7 112c	145 n. 128	1:1 74d	121 n. 54, 122 n. 57

Sifre Deuteronomy

- | | | | |
|-----------------|----------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| 6, p. 15 | 95 n. 185 | 91, p. 230 | 239 n. 21 |
| 22, p. 33 | 180 | 99, p. 246 | 73 n. 115, 183 n. 44 |
| 24, p. 34 | 95 n. 185 | 99, pp. 246–247 | 181 |
| 25, p. 35 | 228 | 102, p. 253 | 194 |
| 29, p. 47 | 93 n. 177 | 103, p. 255 | 73 |
| 32, p. 55 | 205 n. 97 | 105, pp. 261–262 | 73, 77 |
| 33, p. 59 | 93 n. 177 | 105, p. 263 | 193 |
| 40, p. 81 | 217 n. 128 | 107, p. 269 | 50 n. 34 |
| 43, p. 94 | 188 n. 61 | 112, p. 310 | 110 |
| 48, p. 113 | 164 n. 183 | 113, pp. 313–314 | 291 n. 56 |
| 49, pp. 114–115 | 204–205 | 115, p. 322 | 72 n. 111 |
| 54, p. 121 | 264–265 | 116, p. 339 | 95 n. 182 |
| 83, p. 149 | 130 | 117, p. 351 | 162 n. 180 |
| 96, p. 157 | 93 n. 177 | 119, p. 364 | 95 n. 185 |
| 104, p. 163 | 268 n. 112 | 123, pp. 391–392 | 50 n. 34 |
| 110, p. 171 | 98–99 | 124, pp. 395–396 | 51 n. 39 |
| 116, p. 175 | 122 n. 57 | 125, p. 408 | 129 n. 78 |
| 119, p. 178 | 112 n. 25, 122 n. 57 | 129, p. 420 | 51 n. 39 |
| 222, p. 256 | 112 n. 25 | 133, pp. 444–445 | 292 n. 57 |
| 228, p. 260 | 112 n. 25 | 133, p. 445 | 291 |
| 241, p. 271 | 163 | 135, p. 457 | 95 |
| 303, p. 321 | 98 n. 200 | 142, p. 477 | 52 |
| 312, p. 353 | 239–240 | 152, p. 495 | 146 |
| 317, p. 360 | 205–206 | 153, p. 506 | 97 n. 193 |
| 332, p. 381 | 204 | 154, p. 513 | 97 n. 193 |
| 333, p. 383 | 239 n. 21 | 157, p. 523 | 198 |
| 342, p. 393 | 239 n. 21 | 157, p. 527 | 147–148 |
| | | 158, p. 531 | 162 n. 180 |
| | | 159, p. 534 | 95 n. 182 |

Sifre Numbers

- | | |
|-----------------|------------|
| 1, p. 2 | 49 n. 31 |
| 14, p. 42 | 50 n. 34 |
| 15, p. 45 | 50 n. 34 |
| 20, p. 54 | 149 |
| 23, pp. 62–63 | 128–129 |
| 25, p. 70 | 143 |
| 26, p. 75 | 143 |
| 38, p. 101 | 149 n. 135 |
| 39, p. 106 | 288 |
| 42, pp. 112–115 | 217 n. 128 |
| 42, p. 121 | 219 |
| 42, pp. 123–124 | 221 |
| 58, p. 146 | 216 n. 124 |
| 59, p. 148 | 93 n. 177 |
| 63, p. 155 | 219 |
| 68, p. 163 | 291 n. 56 |
| 73, pp. 174–175 | 50 n. 34 |
| 73, p. 174 | 292 n. 57 |

Sifre Zuta Numbers

- | | |
|---------------|------------|
| 5:12, p. 232 | 121 n. 54 |
| 5:29, p. 238 | 149 |
| 5:30, p. 238 | 156 n. 164 |
| 6:3, p. 240 | 129 n. 79 |
| 6:5, p. 241 | 143 n. 119 |
| 6:13, p. 244 | 149 n. 136 |
| 6:21, p. 246 | 149 n. 136 |
| 7:3, p. 251 | 195 n. 71 |
| 7:5, p. 251 | 195 n. 71 |
| 7:84, p. 253 | 239 n. 21 |
| 12:1, p. 274 | 182 n. 46 |
| 12:5, p. 275 | 194–195 |
| 12:12, p. 277 | 93 n. 177 |
| 15:5, p. 281 | 156 n. 164 |
| 15:19, p. 283 | 156 n. 162 |
| 27:18, p. 321 | 195 |
| 30:3, p. 325 | 148 n. 133 |
| 31:21, p. 329 | 162 n. 180 |

Song of Songs Rabba		<i>t. Ber.</i>	
1.2.6	254 n. 65, 255, n. 67	1:14	124 n. 67
		4:1	96 n.187
Tanhuma			
<i>Re'eh</i>		<i>t. Parah</i>	
11, p. 43		10:3	143 n. 120
	293 n. 62		
<i>Tsav</i>		<i>t. Shabb.</i>	
14, p. 36	293 n. 62	15:9	112 n. 25
		16:17	162 n. 181
Tanhuma (Buber)			
<i>Shemot</i>		<i>t. Sotah</i>	
18, p. 10	195 n. 72	1:17	217–218
		4:6	181 n. 41
<i>Ve-Zot ha-Berakha</i>		6:10–11	292 n. 57
7, pp. 56–57	116 n. 39	12:3	205 n. 97
Tosefta		<i>t. Yoma</i>	
<i>t. B. Qam.</i>		3:3	294 n. 67
9:30	93 n. 177		

Homer

<i>Iliad</i>		4.59	86
1.8–10	67	4.105–109	202
1.11	305 n. 93	4.109	203
1.15	250 n. 57	4.121–124	253 n. 63
1.108	125 n. 69	4.137	44 n. 11
1.162	305 n. 93	4.158–159	46
1.169–171	279–280	4.187	44 n. 11
1.361	131	4.221	190
1.499	95 n. 185	4.216	44 n. 11
1.512–3	65	4.308	287
2.2	46	4.342	201
2.8	131	4.431	62
2.448	209	4.434	106
2.612–614	186	4.439–440	234
2.645–649	207–208	4.512–513	191–192
2.649	211–212	5.1–7	200
2.788	113	5.4	201–202
3.2	305 n. 93	5.31	124
3.28	106	5.118	231–235
3.111–112	190	5.137	130–131
3.269–270	47–48	5.140	130–131
4.2	214	5.265	172
4.13	237 n. 18	5.856–857	42

5.902	106	12.1–3	140–141
6.172	106	12.40	250–251
6.191–199	197 n. 76	12.101	197
6.258–261	283	12.316	201
6.264–268	283–284	12.331–334	58
6.416–419	44	12.333–334	249
7.92–95	66	12.352	249
7.125	66	12.442	106
7.226–230	191–192	13.299	233–234
7.266–268	191–192	13.306	153
7.471	134	13.374–382	172
8.179	106	13.673	201–202
8.184–190	281–282	14.14–15	232
8.242	58	14.253	46
8.289	90	15.1–5	160
8.323–327	251	15.3	159–160
8.325–326	251–253	15.119	233–235
8.345–347	60	15.317	204 n. 96
8.435	231, 235–237	15.349–351	91
8.564–9.3	140	15.746–16.2	138
9.1	138–139, 159–160	16.1	138
9.67	106	16.849–850	280–281
9.385	131	16.852–854	176
9.385–390	227	17.350	177
9.394	87	17.366	201
9.465	134	17.719	85 n. 149
10.120	153	18.1	138–139, 141, 201–202
10.222	62–3	18.68–69	247
10.300	174	18.535	286
10.314–315	173	19.415–417	199–200
10.325–326	62–3	20.21	248–249
10.434	174	20.49	106
10.437	227	20.213–243	214
10.446–447	173	20.232–235	214
10.447	174	20.371–371	123–124
10.448	173	21.17	184
10.491–493	174	21.67	184
11.172	305 n. 93	21.67–70	184
11.197–198	59	21.154–156	177–178
11.505–507	302	22.1	60
11.574	204 n. 96	22.149	232
11.596	138–139, 201–202	22.151	232
11.632–637	301–302	22.208	213–214
11.636	302–303, 306	22.251	213–214
11.637	303	22.262	87
11.692	212–213	22.263	89
11.844–846	185	22.406	287
12.1	138–139	22.468–469	57

23.1	138–139	<i>Odyssey</i>	
23.66	88	3.2	233–234, 239
23.281	106	4.49–50	287
23.326–328	270–271	6.1	138–139
23.378	131	6.79	106
23.399–400	175	6.251	106
23.403–406	175	7.1	138–139, 160
23.509	236–237	7.107	106
23.782–783	175	8.239	61
24.128–130	89, 90	9.5–11	86 n. 153
24.257	84	11.281	212–213
24.486–489	177	11.286	212–213
24.495–497	212–213	17.539	131
24.526	88	19.172–174	208
24.527–528	83	19.174	211–212
		22.120–1	236

Homeric Scholia

Sch. AbT <i>Il.</i> 1.6 Ariston.	106 n. 6	Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 3.423a Ariston.	13 n. 48, 282 n. 29
Sch. b <i>Il.</i> 1.9 ex.	67, 77	Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 4.13 ex.	237 n. 18
Sch. AbT <i>Il.</i> 1.96 Ariston.	106 n. 6	Sch. AbT <i>Il.</i> 4.59b ex.	86
Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 1.108a Did.	125 n. 69	Sch. AbT <i>Il.</i> 4.109b ex.	203
Sch. T <i>Il.</i> 1.108b Did.	125 n. 69	Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 4.159a Ariston.	47
Sch. D <i>Il.</i> 1.108	113 n. 28	Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 4.221 ex.	190
Sch. T <i>Il.</i> 1.213 ex. (Porph?)	178 n. 33	Sch. T <i>Il.</i> 4.308b ex.	287
Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 1.169–171 ex.	280	Sch. T <i>Il.</i> 4.405a1 ex.	95 n. 185
Sch. <i>Il.</i> bT 1.349b ex.	95 n. 185	Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 4.439–40 Ariston.	86 n. 153
Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 1.364b1 Hrd.	44 n. 12	Sch. AbT <i>Il.</i> 5.31 ex.	124 n. 66
Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 1.388 Nic.	246 n. 49	Sch. D <i>Il.</i> 5.31	124
Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 1.416 ex.	57 n. 55	Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 5.118c ex.	232
Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 1.499b ex.	95 n. 185	Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 5.140a1 Ariston.	130–131
Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 1.512c ex.	65, 77	Sch. b <i>Il.</i> 5.260 ex.	57 n. 55
Sch. D <i>Il.</i> 1.514	131 n. 85	Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 5.265 ex.	172
Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 1.553b Did.	125 n. 69	Sch. D <i>Il.</i> 5.385	55 n. 47
Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 2.2b Ariston.	46	Sch. D <i>Il.</i> 5.422	86 n. 153
Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 2.8a1 ex.	131	Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 5.857b Ariston.	43
Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 2.147a Nic.	249 n. 55	Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 5.880 ex.	82 n. 138
Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 2.450b Nic.	247	Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 6.37–65 ex.	141 n. 115
Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 2.612 Ariston.	186 n. 55	Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 6.265 Ariston.	283 n. 31
Sch. Ab <i>Il.</i> 2.612–4 ex.	186	Sch. T <i>Il.</i> 6.394b1 ex.	71 n. 107
Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 2.649 Ariston.	211–212	Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 6.417a Ariston.	44
Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 2.278–282 ex.	197 n. 175	Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 6.459 Ariston.	46 n. 18
Sch. A bT <i>Il.</i> 2.341 Ariston.	48	Sch. T <i>Il.</i> 7.94a1 ex.	66
Sch. pap. <i>Il.</i> 2.788	113	Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 7.125 ex.	66
Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 3.100a ex.	287 n. 46	Sch. T <i>Il.</i> 7.471 ex.	134 n. 94
Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 3.270a Ariston.	48 n. 27		

- Sch. D *II*. 7.471 134
- Sch. bT *II*. 8.39a ex. 95 n. 185
- Sch. T *II*. 8.53b ex. 141 n. 115
- Sch. b *II*. 8.188–90a1 ex. 281
- Sch. A *II*. 8.188–90a3 ex. 282 n. 28
- Sch. A *II*. 8.189b Did. 282
- Sch. bT *II*. 8.209 ex. 141 n. 115
- Sch. b *II*. 8.242a1 ex. 58
- Sch. T *II*. 8.289 ex. 90
- Sch. A *II*. 8.325a1 Nic. 251
- Sch. T *II*. 8.325a2 Nic. 251
- Sch. bT *II*. 8.345–7 ex. 60
- Sch. A *II*. 8.435b Nic. 236
- Sch. AbT *II*. 8.435c ex. 236
- Sch. A *II*. 8.513b Ariston. 231 n. 5
- Sch. bT *II*. 9.0a ex. 140
- Sch. A *II*. 9.131 Ariston. 86 n. 154
- Sch. A *II*. 9.385a1 Ariston. 131
- Sch. T *II*. 9.394a1 ex. 87
- Sch. D *II*. 9.465 134
- Sch. A *II*. 9.571a Ariston. 214 n. 118
- Sch. A *II*. 9.678a ex. 88 n. 159
- Sch. AbT *II*. 10.10a ex. 88 n. 159
- Sch. AbT *II*. 10.25a ex. 292
- Sch. bT *II*. 32a ex. 293
- Sch. A *II*. 10.53b Ariston. 248 n. 54
- Sch. A *II*. 10.110 Ariston. 248 n. 54
- Sch. A *II*. 10.112 Ariston. 248 n. 54
- Sch. A *II*. 10.120b Ariston. 153
- Sch. bT *II*. 10.124b ex. 293 n. 60
- Sch. A *II*. 10.187 Ariston. 46 n. 22
- Sch. T. *II*. 10.218a1 ex. 63 n. 85
- Sch. T *II*. 10.317b ex. 63 n. 85
- Sch. bT *II*. 10.318 ex. 63 n. 85
- Sch. bT *II*. 10.321 ex. 63 n. 85
- Sch. T *II*. 10.324a ex. 63 n. 85
- Sch. bT *II*. 10.328 ex. 63 n. 85
- Sch. bT *II*. 10.419–20c ex. 91
- Sch. A *II*. 10.447a Ariston. 173
- Sch. bT *II*. 10.447b ex. 174, 271
- Sch. T *II*. 10.493 ex. 174
- Sch. T *II*. 10.567 ex. 287 n. 46
- Sch. A *II*. 11.6 Ariston. 248 n. 54
- Sch. T *II*. 11.149 Nic. 141 n. 116
- Sch. A *II*. 11.150 Nic. 141 n. 116
- Sch. A *II*. 11.186a ex. 131 n. 84
- Sch. bT *II*. 11.197–8 ex. 59
- Sch. T *II*. 11.243c1 ex. 287 n. 46
- Sch. A *II*. 11.409a Nic. 246 n. 49
- Sch. T *II*. 11.542a1 ex. 88 n. 159
- Sch. b *II*. 11.542a2 ex. 88 n. 159
- Sch. A *II*. 11.559b Ariston. 214 n. 118
- Sch. A *II*. 11.574 Ariston. 204 n. 96
- Sch. A *II*. 11.636b Hrd. 302 n. 81
- Sch. T *II*. 11.636c1 ex. 302 n. 81,
306 n. 96
- Sch. b *II*. 11.636c2 ex. 302 n. 81,
306 n. 96
- Sch. D *II*. 11.636 302 n. 81,
306 n. 96
- Sch. A *II*. 11.692a Ariston. 212–213
- Sch. D *II*. 11.692 212 n. 116
- Sch. A *II*. 11.746 Nic. 249 n. 55
- Sch. bT *II*. 11.787 ex. 65 n. 89
- Sch. A *II*. 11.826a ex. 131 n. 84
- Sch. AbT *II*. 11.846 ex. 185
- Sch. AbT *II*. 12.1–2a ex. 141
- Sch. A *II*. 12.22a Ariston. 84 n. 146
- Sch. A *II*. 12.40a1 Nic. 250–251
- Sch. T *II*. 12.101 ex. 197
- Sch. A *II*. 12.258a Ariston. 248 n. 54
- Sch. A *II*. 12.258b Nic. 248 n. 54
- Sch. A *II*. 13.261a1 Nic. 236 nn. 16–17
- Sch. D *II*. 13.261 236 n. 16
- Sch. T *II*. 12.308a ex. 274 n. 2
- Sch. A *II*. 12.333–4a Nic. 249
- Sch. b *II*. 12.334a2 ex. 58
- Sch. A *II*. 12.388 Nic. 280 n. 22
- Sch. A *II*. 13.299a Ariston. 46 n. 18,
234 n. 9
- Sch. *II*. 13.299b ex. (Ariston.) 234 n. 10
- Sch. A *II*. 13.306a1 Ariston. 153
- Sch. A *II*. 13.348–50 ex. 131 n. 84
- Sch. A *II*. 13.365a Ariston. 214 n. 118
- Sch. bT *II*. 13.374–6a1–2 ex. 174 n. 24
- Sch. bT *II*. 13.430–3 ex. 57 n. 55
- Sch. A *II*. 13.681a Ariston. 248 n. 54
- Sch. T *II*. 13.689 ex. 287 n. 46
- Sch. bT *II*. 14.1b ex. 141 n. 115
- Sch. bT *II*. 14.14–15 ex. 232
- Sch. A *II*. 14.32a Hrd. 86 n. 154
- Sch. A *II*. 14.45a Ariston. 172 n. 20,
174 n. 24
- Sch. A *II*. 14.75–76 Nic. 246 n. 49
- Sch. bT *II*. 14.153b ex. 141 n. 115
- Sch. bT *II*. 14.229a ex. 95 n. 185

Sch. A. <i>Il.</i> 14.242 Ariston.	46 n. 22	Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 20.21b ex.	249
Sch. A. <i>Il.</i> 14.354 Ariston.	46 n. 22	Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 20.83–5 ex.	57 n. 55
Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 14.442 Ariston.	86 n. 154	Sch. AT <i>Il.</i> 21.17a1 Ariston.	184
Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 14.473 ex.	174 n. 24	Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 21.17b1 Ariston.	184
Sch. A. <i>Il.</i> 14.500 Ariston.	86 n. 153, 131 n. 84	Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 21.334–335 Nic.	280 n. 22
Sch. T <i>Il.</i> 15.1b1 ex.	274 n. 2	Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 21.379d ex.	57 n. 55
Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 15.1b3 ex.	274 n. 2	Sch. b <i>Il.</i> 21.469c2 ex.	57
Sch. D <i>Il.</i> 15.53	131 n. 85	Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 21.471a Ariston.	106 n. 6
Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 15.119 Ariston.	233	Sch. T <i>Il.</i> 22.208a2 Ariston.	213
Sch. AT <i>Il.</i> 15.119 Ariston.	86 nn. 153–154	Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 22.251a2 Ariston.	214
Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 15.128a Nic.	246 n. 49	Sch. T <i>Il.</i> 22.262 ex.	87
Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 15.246–7 ex.	178 n. 33	Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 22.263b ex.	89
Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 15.349–51 ex.	91	Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 22.318a Ariston.	214 n. 118
Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 15.449–51a Ariston.	248 n. 54	Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 22.354a ex.	274 n. 2
Sch. b <i>Il.</i> 15.496–8a2 ex.	286 n. 44	Sch. T <i>Il.</i> 22.406 ex.	287, 298
Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 16.1a ex.	138–139	Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 22.428a Nic.	249 n. 55
Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 16.146b1–2 ex.	57 n. 55	Sch. A. <i>Il.</i> 23.63a Ariston.	46 n. 22
Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 16.161a Ariston.	86 n. 154	Sch. AbT <i>Il.</i> 23.66 ex.	88
Sch. T <i>Il.</i> 16.175c1 ex.	252 n. 60	Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 23.97–8 Nic.	249 n. 55
Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 16.261c ex.	131 n. 84	Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 23.119–120b ex.	287 n. 46
Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 16.387a ex.	57 n. 55	Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 23.285–6 Nic.	249 n. 55
Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 16.431–61 ex.	141 n. 115	Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 23.328 ex.	271
Sch. T <i>Il.</i> 16.433–8a1 ex.	57 n. 55	Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 23.378a1 Ariston.	131
Sch. A. <i>Il.</i> 16.454 Ariston.	47	Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 23.405–6a Ariston.	175
Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 16.850a Ariston.	280 n. 25, 281 n. 26	Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 23.405–6b ex.	175
Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 16.850b ex.	281 n. 26	Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 23.509a1 Ariston.	237
Sch. AT <i>Il.</i> 16.854a1 ex.	176	Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 24.3 ex.	74 n. 116
Sch. b <i>Il.</i> 16.854a2 ex.	176 n. 28	Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 24.8a Hrd.	44 n. 12
Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 17.404–5b ex.	57 n. 55	Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 24.86 Ariston.	106 n. 6
Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 17.426–8 ex.	141 n. 115	Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 24.110b1 Did.	252 n. 60
Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 17.522a ex.	274 n. 2	Sch. AT <i>Il.</i> 24.129a1 ex.	90 n. 163
Sch. T <i>Il.</i> 17.542 ex.	274 n. 2	Sch. b <i>Il.</i> 24.129a2 ex.	90
Sch. b <i>Il.</i> 17.671b ex.	57 n. 55	Sch. T <i>Il.</i> 24.192a D	95 n. 185
Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 17.719 Ariston.	84 n. 146, 85 n. 149	Sch. D <i>Il.</i> 24.192	95 n. 185
Sch. T <i>Il.</i> 17.755b1 ex.	95 n. 185	Sch. T <i>Il.</i> 24.223 ex.	287 n. 46
Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 18.1a ex.	141	Sch. T <i>Il.</i> 24.257a ex.	84
Sch. T <i>Il.</i> 18.38 ex.	86 n. 153	Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 24.257b Ariston.	84 n. 147
Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 18.68–9 Nic.	247	Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 24.262 ex.	89 n. 161
Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 18.174 Ariston.	282 n. 29	Sch. T <i>Il.</i> 24.358–360 ex.	274 n. 2
Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 18.314–5 ex.	141 n. 115	Sch. T <i>Il.</i> 24.369 ex.	89 n. 161
Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 18.535 ex.	286	Sch. b <i>Il.</i> 24.376–7a1 ex.	88 n. 159
Sch. bT <i>Il.</i> 18.591–2b ex.	271	Sch. T <i>Il.</i> 24.446a ex.	287 n. 46
Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 19.416–7 Ariston.	200	Sch. T <i>Il.</i> 24.476b ex.	62 n. 77
Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 20.21a Nic.	248	Sch. T <i>Il.</i> 24.488–9 ex.	177
		Sch. T <i>Il.</i> 24.526 ex.	88
		Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 24.527–8a Ariston.	83
		Sch. A <i>Il.</i> 24.588 Ariston.	287 n. 47

Sch. <i>Od.</i> 1.268a ex.	233 n. 6	Sch. <i>Od.</i> 5.229a Ariston.	287 n. 46
Sch. <i>Od.</i> 1.361e ex.	57 n. 55	Sch. <i>Od.</i> 8.362b	86 n. 153
Sch. <i>Od.</i> 3.313a Ariston.	185 n. 52	Sch. <i>VHQ Od.</i> 11.286	212 n. 116
Sch. <i>Od.</i> 4.42e ex.	236 n. 16	Sch. <i>Q Od.</i> 14.214	95 n. 185
Sch. <i>Od.</i> 4.50a Ariston.	287	Sch. <i>H Od.</i> 17.501	176 n. 27
Sch. <i>Od.</i> 4.93b ex.	57 n. 55	Sch. <i>Q Od.</i> 18.330	282 n. 29
Sch. <i>Od.</i> 4.364b ex.	57 n. 55	Sch. <i>VHQ Od.</i> 19.174	209 n. 105
Sch. <i>Od.</i> 4.746a	134 n. 94		

Greek and Latin Authors

Aelius Theon		Aristophanes	
<i>Prog.</i>		<i>Ran.</i>	
82	274 n. 5	1030–1035	68 n. 93
86	304 n. 90	1151–1175	103, 106
Aeschilus		Aristotle	
<i>Myrmid.</i>		<i>Et. Nic.</i>	
Fr. 139	303–304	4.3 1124b	68 n. 93
Aesop		<i>Fr.</i>	
<i>Fab.</i>		102 (Rose)	
149	87 n. 155	146 (Rose)	209
264	87 n. 155	370 (Gigon)	209
Alexander		<i>Phys.</i>	
<i>Fig.</i>		1.2 185b	
p. 20	123		134
p. 29	122–3	<i>Poet.</i>	
Antimachus		1455a	
Fr. 37	234	1461a	245, 270
Fr. 94	46 n. 20	1461b	199
Apollonius Dyscolus		<i>Rhet.</i>	
<i>Con.</i>		3.3.3 1406a	
p. 180	155	3.8.6 1409a	107
p. 186	159–160	3.11.3 1411b–12a	139 n. 105
p. 216	161	3.11.15–16 1413a	204 n. 96
p. 222	161 n. 177		227
[Apollodorus]		<i>Soph. El.</i>	
<i>Epit.</i>		165b	
6.8–11	209 n. 105	166a	229
		166b	245
			270

[Aristotle]		Epicurus	
<i>Rhet. Al.</i>		Rat. Sen. 1	88
30.7	274	Gnom. Vat 1	88
Athenaeus		Euripides	
<i>Deipnosophistae</i>		<i>Tro.</i>	
11.84 493a	302	1127–1129	
11.85 493c–e	302–303		
11.85 494a–b	11 n. 41, 303–304	Eustathius	
		<i>Ad Il.</i>	
Cicero		vol. 1, p. 252	46 n. 23
<i>Fam.</i>		vol. 1, p. 468	186 n. 54
3.11.59	307	vol. 1, p. 545	113
Cocondrius		<i>Ad Od.</i>	
<i>Trop.</i>		vol. 1, p. 110	235 n. 15
5, pp. 784–785	204 n. 96		
Demosthenes		Heraclitus	
25.1.58	123	<i>Queast. Hom.</i>	
		1.5–7	1–2
Derveni Papyrus		Hermogenes	
4:1	276 n. 10	<i>Method.</i>	
8:3–12	276–277	14	274 n. 6
13:1	277		
Dictys of Crete		Herodotus	
<i>Ephem.</i>		1.66	123 n. 64
6.7–9	178 n. 32	2.98	177 n. 29
Dio Chrysostom		Hesiod	
18.8	1	<i>Op.</i>	
		94	83
		456	209
Diogenes Laertius		<i>Theog.</i>	
<i>Vit. Phil.</i>		454–457	86 n. 151
2.11	68 n. 93		
Dionysius Thrax		Hesychius	
<i>Ars</i>		<i>Lex.</i>	
25	155	vol. 3, p. 290	135 n. 98
90	161		
Donatus		Horace	
<i>De tropis</i>		<i>Ars</i>	
10	298–299	445–450	229
11	299 n. 72		
12	299 n. 71	Iamblichus	
15	299 n. 73	<i>Vit. Pyth.</i>	
		42	90 n. 164

109	90 n. 164	<i>Resp.</i>	
		606e	40
Isocrates			
<i>Paneg.</i>		Plutarch	
159	59 n. 60	<i>Quaestiones Convivales</i>	
		6.9	107
Lesbonax			
<i>Fig.</i>		<i>Quomodo adul.</i>	
31B	250 n. 57	16a	61
		19e	60
[Longinus]		19f–20a	60–61
<i>Subl.</i>		20c	60
22	275	27a	62
23	114	29d–e	62
		29e–f	62–63
Maximus of Tyre			
<i>Diss.</i>		<i>Vit. Mar.</i>	
4	81 n. 131	23.3	63 n. 86
7	81 n. 131		
26	81 n. 131	[Plutarch]	
		<i>Vit. Hom.</i>	
Menander		30	275 n. 8, 305 n. 93
Fr. 781	87	32	123–124
		39	151 n. 145
Michael of Ephesus		71	227
<i>Elen. Comm.</i>		146	62
p. 33	271	150	86 n. 153
		152–160	89 n. 162
Philostratus		153	81 n. 132
<i>Her.</i>		154	90 n. 164
36.4	59 n. 59	218	40
<i>VA</i>		Porphyrius	
4.16	59 n. 59	<i>Quaest. Hom. II.</i>	
		2.649	208–209
Plato		4.105–11	203
<i>Apol.</i>		4.434	106–107
39c	176	5.7	200–201
		5.20	202 n. 90
<i>Ion</i>		6.265	283
530c–d	305 n. 95	7.229–230	191–192
		8.322–329	252–253
<i>Phdr.</i>		9.90	27 n. 97
241c–d	89	9.682–683	167, 225–226
		10.252–253	225
<i>Prt.</i>		10.276	202 nn. 89–90
339b–c	278	11.637	305–306
343e–344a	278–279	12.127–132	273

16.850 (Schrader)	280–281	Suda	
18.590–593	271 n. 121	OI 123	27 n. 97
20.232–235	214–215	Σ 394	135 n. 98
		Σ 859	302 n. 82
<i>Quaest. Hom. Il.</i> (Sodano)			
56.3–4	43 n. 6, 45	Theophrastus	
		<i>Hist. Plant.</i>	
Quintilian		5.4.3	271
<i>Inst.</i>			
7.9.7–8	245, 247 n. 52	Tiberius	
7.9.10	235 n. 14	<i>Fig. Dem.</i>	
8.6.62–65	274–275	26	123 n. 62
8.6.65	305 n. 93		
[Rufinus]		Tryphon	
<i>Lex.</i>		i, p. 197	305
40	114 n. 34	i, pp. 203–204	231
		ii, 2, p. 237	204 n. 96
<i>Schem.</i>		ii, 5, p. 239	274 n. 2
8	123 n. 61	ii, 21, p. 245	231 n. 4
		Vergil	
Satyrus		<i>Aen.</i>	
Fr. 5	145 n. 127	6.247	114 n. 34
		9.427	123 n. 61
Scholia to Euripides		<i>Ecl.</i>	
<i>Sch. Tro.</i> 1128	178	2.69	123 n. 61
		3.79	123 n. 61
Scholia to Hesiod		<i>Geor.</i>	
<i>Sch. Op.</i> 94a	83	4.108	114, n. 34
<i>Sch. Op.</i> 90–94	84 n. 144		
Sextus Empiricus		Vita Sophoclis	
<i>Adv. Gramm.</i>		pp. 36–37	145 n. 127
273	88 n. 157		
Simonides		Xenophanes	
Fr. 37.1	278	Fr. 10	40
Fr. 94	46 n.21		
Sophocles		Xenophon	
<i>El.</i>		<i>Symp.</i>	
1163–1164	123	4.6	41
Strabo		Zonaus	
<i>Geog.</i>		<i>Fig.</i>	
1.1.10	54–55	p. 165	123 n. 61
10.4.15	209 n. 105, 210–211		

Second Temple and Christian Authors

Clement of Alexandria		Origen	
<i>Ecl.</i>		<i>Ephes.</i>	
56.1	285 n. 37	9.1–10	285 n. 38
<i>Strom.</i>		<i>Gen.</i>	
1.19.24	72 n. 112	Fr. D9	250 n. 59
2.15.70	72 n. 112	Fr. E199	250 n. 59
Demetrius		<i>Luk.</i>	
vol. 1, p. 76	186–187	20a	285
Eusebius		<i>Reg.</i>	
<i>Comm. Isa.</i>		1.1	18 n. 80
1.92.77–82	135 n. 97	<i>Rom.</i>	
<i>Praep. Evang.</i>		4.1–11	285 n. 38
9.29.1	186–187	Pesher Genesis	
Eusebius of Emesa		2:5–7	167
<i>Comm. Gen.</i>		Pesher Habakkuk	
p. 312	189	1:16–2:10	6 n. 21
p. 396	189 n. 62	Philo	
Genesis Apocryphon		<i>Agr.</i>	
12:10, p. 56	241 n. 27	1–2	132
Hieronymus		26	132 n. 87
<i>Quaest. Heb.</i>		27–28	133
p. 8.15–19	183 n. 48	122	70
p. 24.11–12	170 n. 12	157	136
Josephus		171	116 n. 41
<i>Ant.</i>		<i>Conf.</i>	
1.143	241	142	108 n. 14
2.132	187 n. 58	<i>Cong.</i>	
<i>Ap.</i>		73	108 n. 14
1.19–27	27 n. 97	178–179	117
2.154–155	27 n. 97	<i>Det.</i>	
2.255–256	27 n. 97	15	108 n. 14
Jubilees		47	116 n. 41
4:33	241	70	116 n. 41
10:14	241	118	132 n. 87

<i>Deus</i>		<i>Plant.</i>	
158	136 n. 102	113	246
		137–171	132
<i>Ebr.</i>		150	132–133
127	136 n. 99	154	134
138	136 n. 99		
143	136 nn. 99–100	<i>Post.</i>	
149	136 nn. 99–100	1–2	72 n. 110
151	136 nn. 99–100		
		<i>QG</i>	
<i>Fug.</i>		1.16	116 n. 40
54–55	115	1.63 (Aucher)	183
		1.63 (Petit)	183 n. 49
<i>Gig.</i>		2.47	206 n. 101
34	108 n. 14, 124–5	2.79	241
40	69 n. 100	4.168 (Aucher)	114 n. 36
54	69 n. 99		
		<i>QE</i>	
<i>Her.</i>		2.4	117 n. 44
182	69 n. 99	2.17	118 n. 48
		2.34	108
<i>Ios.</i>		<i>Sacr.</i>	
10	123 n. 65	42	69 n. 100
<i>Leg.</i>		<i>Somn.</i>	
1.98	136 n. 100	1.73	206 n. 101
1.105–7	116	2.23–25	118
1.249	136 n. 100	2.25	108 n. 14
3.51	271	2.164	136 n. 102
3.147	108	2.183	206 n. 101
4.39	69 n. 100	2.190	136
4.66	69 n. 100	2.192	136 n. 102
<i>Mig.</i>		<i>Spec.</i>	
4	206 n. 101	1.8–10	119
8	69 n. 99	1.98	135
14	69 n. 99	1.249	135
48	108 n. 14		
<i>Mos.</i>		<i>Virt.</i>	
1.214–216	187 n. 58	165	69 n. 100
<i>Mut.</i>		[Philo]	
13	284	<i>de Sam.</i>	
220	69 n. 99	21	7 n. 21
236	69 n. 99		
256	206 n. 101	Temple Scroll	
		21:10, p. 160	130 n. 80

Testament of Reuven
 1:10 135 n. 97

Testament of Zebulun
 8:3 94 n. 177

Theodoret of Cyrus
Quaest. Oct.
 Gen. lviii, p. 118 168 n. 3
 Ex. xxxiii, p. 278 187 n. 58

Comm. Isa.
 2.570–574 135 n. 97
 8.61–65 135 n. 97