Theodotus composed a poem which used the vocabulary and meter of Greek epic poetry and which was probably entitled On the Jews. From the poem eight fragments survive. Some short summaries of sections of the poem also survive; they introduce the fragments. All of these pieces pertain to the story of the rape of Jacob’s daughter Dinah at Shechem as recorded in Genesis 34. In the first fragment Theodotus gives a description of the city of Shechem and its environs. In a second brief fragment Theodotus presents the arrival of Jacob at Shechem. Then, in the third fragment, Theodotus recalls the earlier departure of Jacob for Mesopotamia, his marriages with Leah and Rachel, and his subsequent return to Canaan. After a summary of the rape of Dinah, fragment 4 presents the need of the Shechemites to be circumcised before Dinah can be married. The fifth fragment portrays the origin of the law of circumcision. After a summary of the plan of Simeon and Levi to slay Hamor and Sychem is given, the sixth fragment offers their motivation: a divine oracle. The seventh fragment then describes the evil nature of the Shechemites, which justifies the action. In the final fragment the actual slaying of Hamor and Sychem is poetically portrayed, and then the tale is concluded by the withdrawal from Shechem of the sons of Jacob with their booty.

Transmission

The fragments have been preserved because of the work of Alexander Polyhistor, the Greek historian, who flourished in the mid first century B.C. Because of the presence of the distinctive epic vocabulary and meter within, it is clear that Alexander has faithfully preserved the wording of the fragments. In addition, he has provided us with the summaries of the omitted parts of the poem or the omitted parts of this section of the poem, if the poem was actually longer than our fragments indicate. A higher incidence of non-epic words in these summaries indicates that Alexander has preferred normal prose vocabulary for his summations rather than epic diction. However, the agreement between the account in Genesis and the summations of Alexander shows that here, too, Alexander has been faithful to his source, Theodotus.¹

Alexander Polyhistor’s On the Jews is no longer extant in its entirety. However, excerpts from his writing have been preserved by Eusebius of Caesarea (c. A.D. 260–340) in his Praeparatio Evangelica; the material pertaining to Theodotus appears in 9.22.1–11.²

Provenance

Over the years, a number of scholars have suggested that Theodotus was a Samaritan

¹ On the fidelity of Alexander Polyhistor to his sources, see Freudenthal, Alexander Polyhistor, pp. 17–34. Alexander Polyhistor in his summation uses such non-epic words as ἑδμορέω, “to till the earth,” and ἐριώρεω, “to work in wool.”

² Mras, GCS 43, 1–2, pp. 512–16. The Fs. are also conveniently collected in Jacoby, FGH, vol. 3C, no. 732, pp. 692–94.
Various reasons, such as the following, have been offered in support of this hypothesis. The preserved part of the poem pertains to Shechem, a Samaritan city. The city is referred to as a "holy city." The title On the Jews, even if it is the correct title, could have been used by a Samaritan. The identification of Shechem as the son of Hermes in the summary before the first fragment fits in with the euhemeristic impulse in other Samaritan works.

Other scholars, however, have proposed the thesis that Theodotus was a Jewish author, for the following reasons. Although Theodotus was a Greek name, it is known to have been used by Jews as well as Samaritans. As the title suggests, the poem may have been much longer than the fragments indicate and may not have been restricted to Shechem. Identification of Shechem as a "holy city" can be understood as epic language rather than as a statement about the religious significance of Shechem. In addition, the euhemeristic impulse is not restricted to Samaritan literature. Thus, there seems to be no clear evidence to compel a decision in favor of a Samaritan or Jewish hypothesis.

In his poem, Theodotus shows an awareness of post-biblical traditions, which were available in Palestine. The story of the return of Jacob, the rape of Dinah, and the attack by the sons of Jacob, is also recalled in one apocryphal work, the Book of Judith, and two pseudepigraphic works, Jubilees and the Testament of Levi. All three works, at least in their origins, derive from Palestine sometime between the third and first centuries B.C. In these writings it is made clear that the attack upon the Shechemites was not merely an act of revenge by the sons of Jacob but, rather, that it was a just act of punishment willed by God (Jdt 9:2; Jud 30:6–7; TLevi 5:1–5; 6:8, 11). Further, just as fragment 7 of Theodotus stressed the unrighteousness of the Shechemites in that they did not honor anyone who came to them, whether evil or noble, so the Testament of Levi 6:8–10 suggests an earlier attack upon Sarah and Rebecca similar to that upon Dinah. This passage in the Testament of Levi further proposes that the Shechemites persecuted Abraham and his kin when they were strangers. Thirdly, just as fragment 8 of Theodotus specifies—beyond the biblical text—that it is Simeon who slays Hamor, and Levi who slays Sychem, so, too, the Testament of Levi 6:4 specifies the matter in the same way. However, it is interesting to note that Levi is given greater emphasis than Simeon in the Testament and Jubilees. In the former, Levi slays Sychem before Simeon slays Hamor, and in the latter Levi and his descendants are chosen to be priests and Levites because of his slaying of the enemies of Israel. In contrast Simeon takes the initiative in Theodotus (cf. Jdt 9:2). Next, it should also be noted that neither the fragments nor the summaries of Theodotus mention the actual circumcision of the Shechemites. Thus the motif that the Shechemites were attacked while they were still in pain from the circumcision is also omitted. Similarly in Jubilees 30 there is no indication that the Shechemites were actually circumcised. In the Testament (TLevi 6:3) Levi counsels his father and brother against circumcising the Shechemites but then records (6:6) that they were indeed circumcised. Obviously the authors are struggling with the embarrassment of the Shechemites being circumcised, i.e. being given the sign of admittance into Israel and then being slain by the sons of Jacob. The absence in Theodotus of the account of the circumcision and of the motif of the pain may be due to the summation and omission by Alexander Polyhistor, but it is also possible that Theodotus omitted the circumcision because he shared the same concern as Jubilees and the Testament of Levi.

The poem of Theodotus also reflects the interest in epic poetry during the hellenistic

---

3 R. J. Bull, "A Note on Theodotus' Description of Shechem," HTR 60 (1967) 223f. Bull refers to ancient reports that the Samaritans would allow themselves to be called Jews when it was politically expedient to do so.
4 M. Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism (Philadelphia, 1974) vol. 1, pp. 89, 266; vol. 2, p. 62. The euhemeristic impulse refers to the hellenistic theory that many of the gods were actually men who lived in bygone ages.
5 Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism, vol. 1, p. 64.
6 A. Ludwich, De Theodoti Carmine Graeco-Judaico (Königsberg, 1899) p. 6, n. 8. See Iliad 5.446; 16.100; Odyssey 1.2.
7 Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism, vol. 1, pp. 89, 266.
9 Cf. the description of the temple on Mount Gerizim as the temple of Zeus, the Friend of Strangers, in 2Mac 6:2.
It is well known that in antiquity there was a widespread interest in the poetry of Homer. During the hellenistic period there was a further revival of writing epic poetry, especially at such centers as Alexandria, where such authors as Callimachus (c. 305–240 B.C.) wrote short epic poems, especially upon mythological themes. Other authors, such as Apollonius of Rhodes (third century B.C.) continued the tradition of long epic poems upon mythological themes. In addition, long epic poems were written about hellenistic rulers as well as about various regions of the hellenistic world. Although it is difficult to know the exact nature and extent of the latter poems because our evidence is so fragmentary, it is nevertheless clear that the poets need not have been natives of or residents of the particular regions (e.g. Rhianus of Crete with his Messêniaka in the third century B.C.) but, rather, used the occasion to codify existing traditions. In addition, some poets such as Rhianus of Crete included in their poems motifs of a religious and political value.

It is into this context of an interest in epic poetry during the hellenistic period that Theodotus is to be placed along with the Jewish author Philo the Elder (second century B.C.), who composed an epic poem on Jerusalem in accord with the other regional epics. In his poem Theodotus uses Homeric language and meter as well as terms or usages which are customary in the later, hellenistic epic poets. Occasionally he employs terms or usages not attested in epic poetry.

Alexander Polyhistor states that the title of Theodotus’ composition was On the Jews. Objections to the correctness of this title, such as the following, have been made by scholars. First, it has been argued that a Samaritan author would not give such a title to his work. Second, it has been noted that the poem is concerned with Shechem rather than with the Jews. Third, since the same title appears frequently as the title of the works quoted by Alexander Polyhistor (e.g. Ps-Eup, Art, ArisEx), it is possible that the use of the same title here is erroneous. Fourth, it has been observed that within the poem itself the term which is used to refer to the people is “Hebrews” rather than “Jews” (e.g. PrEv 9.22.6).

In response to these objections, the following observations can be made. It is not clearly proved that the author was in fact a Samaritan. Next, if the title On the Jews is correct, then this episode concerning Shechem may be merely one episode of a cycle or one part of a longer poem. Further, although the term “Hebrews” is more appropriately used for the period prior to the Babylonian captivity, the term “Jews” in the title On the Jews would be an understandable anachronism on the part of an author such as Theodotus. Thus, it seems more probable that the title On the Jews is correct.

In his poem Theodotus draws mainly upon Genesis 34 for his account, although there are also references to the divine command to circumcise in Genesis 17 and to events in the life of Jacob in Genesis 27–33. Theodotus’ use of epic language, however, makes it impossible to establish his dependence upon the Greek of the Septuagint. Because of the recent excavations at Shechem, it may be possible to date more precisely the poem of Theodotus. The exact description of Shechem within the poem indicates an
ewitness of the site and not simply a person who has read Genesis. Further, the archaeological data indicate that from the time of Alexander the Great (c. 331 B.C.) until c. 190 B.C. there was a large city wall around Shechem. However, in the following period (190–150 B.C.) the city wall was no longer maintained and stones were taken from the wall to build towers in front. Since Theodotus describes Shechem as having a "smooth wall" and since this phrase is not a customary epic description, then he must have observed the city prior to the middle of the second century B.C.\textsuperscript{24} and presumably composed his poem at the same time. Such a date as the end of the third century or beginning of the second century B.C. would be appropriate, since it leaves some time between the composition of the poem and its collection by Alexander Polyhistor in the first century B.C.

Such a date may also help to explain the difficulty in deciding whether the author is Samaritan or Jewish. Even though tensions existed between Samaritans and Jews at an earlier period, a final break between them did not occur until later, in the reign of John Hyrcanus (135–105 B.C.).\textsuperscript{25} Prior to that time they were in communication with one another, and the distinction was not necessary. The place of composition is uncertain; Palestine is as possible as Alexandria.

Importance

The poem of Theodotus is significant in that it is another indication of the degree of hellenization which some Jews underwent in the hellenistic period. In terms of its theology, the poem of Theodotus is significant in that it portrays God as the revealer of his commandments, his Law as unchangeable, and circumcision as a necessary part of that Law. Further, Theodotus portrays God as the revealer of oracles, the rewarder of his people, and the punisher of evil persons such as the Shechemites.

The function or functions of Theodotus' poem are not completely clear. Evidently it served to codify existing tradition, as did the other hellenistic regional epics. In a cultural setting in which the gymnasia and Greek education were ever present, the poem may also have served a Jewish need to recast tradition in an epic mode. It probably also served the religious need to recall the necessity of circumcision.
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Fragment 1  Alexander Polyhistor, "On the Jews," in Eusebius, "Praeparatio Evangelica" 9.22.1:

Theodotus in On the Jews says that Shechem took its name from Shechem, the son of Hermes, for he also founded the city. He says that the city is situated in the land of the Jews in the following manner:

Thus the land was good and grazed upon by goats and well watered. There was neither a long path for those entering the city from the field nor even leafy woods for the weary. Instead, very close by the city appear two steep mountains, filled with grass and woods. Between the two of them a narrow path is cut. On one side the bustling Shechem appears, a sacred town, built under (i.e. the mountain) as a base; there was a smooth wall around the town; and the wall for defense up above ran in under the foot of the mountain.

TRANSLATION

Fragment 1 (22.1) a. The possible testimonium to Theodotus is as follows. Josephus, Apion 1.23, 215f.: The name of the city and the name of the person in the land of the Jews. In this paraphrase by Alexander Polyhistor the father of the founder of the city is identified as Ermou and the founder as Sikimiou (both in the genitive case); the name of the city is then spelled as Sikima. Either the text is corrupt here or Alexander Polyhistor has altered his source or Theodotus has deliberately spelled the names in this manner. It means more likely that Theodotus has exploited the difference in spelling between the name of the city and the name of the person in Gen 34 (a contemporary of Jacob) to separate the two figures Sikimios and Sychem from one another. Thus, in accord with other hellenistic regional epics, he can refer back prior to the time of Jacob to the founding of the city and to Sikimios as the founder of Sychem. By separating the two figures and by proposing Sikimios as the founder rather than Sychem, Theodotus also avoids the awkward situation that in Gen 34 the ruler is the father, Emor, rather than the eponymous founder, i.e. Sychem. The name of the son could have been scanned Sikimios to fit epic meter. Further, it seems likely that the name Hamor (Emor) suggested the name Hermes (Ermes) as the name of the founder's father. Thereby the pagan god Hermes would presumably be treated as simply a man by this Jewish author; such a treatment would have appropriately arisen from the euhemeristic impulse of the hellenistic period. Further, it is precisely at the point of the beginning of a city that one would expect an association with mythology, and such was the case in the regional epic poetry of the hellenistic period. See, for example, the fragments of Rhianus of Crete in Jacoby, FGrH, vol. 3A, no. 265, pp. 64-69, and the discussion by K. Ziegler, Das Hellenistische Epos: Ein Vergessenes Kapitel Griechischer Dichtung (Berlin, 1934) pp. 11-21.

d. There is a textual problem here. The text reads en te peri loudaiôn. As it stands, the text could be understood as "in the (book) On the Jews." Or, if this phrase is merely a repetition of the phrase "in On the Jews" in the opening sentence, then the te would need to be emended to to. A third possibility, adopted by the editor Mras, is that the peri should be deleted as a mistaken repetition of the term in the opening sentence and that the phrase be understood as "in the (land) of the Jews." We follow the emendation of Mras.

e. Mount Ebal and Mount Gerizim.

f. The text has been emended by the removal of the term autolipsis, which is extra beyond the meter of the line and probably a later gloss.

g. The consistent perspective from which the entire scene is described seems to be the encampment of Jacob before Shechem as in Gen 33:18-20. The phrase en d heterothi has been translated as "on one side." In Homer heterothi is used alone or in conjunction with enthen. It means "on the other side" when used in conjunction with enthen. When used alone, heterothi can mean "elsewhere" or "in another quarter" or—more freely translated—"on one side." Since heterothi is not used by Theodotus in conjunction with enthen, this latter meaning must be intended by him; the addition of the preposition en merely strengthens the meaning. See R. J. Cunliffe, A Lexikon of the Homeric Dialect (London, 1924) p. 165.

h. The phrase "built under as a base" is in accord with the fact that Shechem was situated on a mound or shoulder at the base of Mount Ebal, but it should be noted that the use of riza in an extended sense to indicate the root or foundation of a mountain is a post-Homeric development.

i. Archaeological excavations have uncovered the remains of this city wall. It was well taken care of (i.e. smooth) from the time of Alexander the Great to the first half of the second century B.C but was disrupted thereafter. See the introduction.

j. The phrase "up above" seems to refer to the fact that Shechem was above the plain where Jacob was encamped. An alternate interpretation might
The text contains a discussion of the names and characteristics of Jacob and his family. It mentions the use of the term "stubborn" and "improvident" in Homer and considers the appropriateness of these terms in describing Jacob's actions. The text also refers to the names of places and people, such as Syria and Mesopotamia, and discusses the historical context of the story.


Next he says that it was occupied by the Hebrews when Hamor was ruling, for Hamor begot a son Sychem. He says, O stranger, Jacob came as a shepherd to the broad city of Shechem; and over their kinsmen Hamor was chief with his son Sychem, a very stubborn pair.


Then concerning Jacob and his arrival in Mesopotamia and his marriage with his two wives and the birth of his children and his arrival from Mesopotamia to Shechem, he said, Jacob came to well-grazed Syria and left behind the broad stream of the Euphrates, a turbulent river. For he had come there when he left the sharp reubeke of his own brother. Laban, who was his cousin and then alone ruled over Syria since he was of [native] blood, graciously received him into his house. He agreed to and promised the marriage of his youngest daughter to him. However, he did not at all aim that this should be but, rather, contrived some trick. He sent Leah, who was her older sister, to the man for his bed. In any case, it did not remain hidden to him; rather, he understood the mischievousness and received the other maiden. He was mated with both, were he his kinfolk. To him there were born eleven sons who were exceedingly wise in mind and a daughter, Dinah, who had a beautiful form, an admirable frame, and a noble spirit.


He says that from the Euphrates Jacob came into Shechem to Hamor. He suggests that it was a high wall for defense that ran around (the town). Our translation rests on a slight emendation of the text, the introduction of the "and" (d) after the term for "the foot of the mountain" (hypotreian).

Fragment 2 (22.2) a. There are difficulties in the first line. The identities of the speaker and the addressee are unclear. Such a dialogue setting with a stranger is found in Homer; e.g. Athene speaks to a mortal (Odyssey 8.195) or some person speaks to Odysseus (Odyssey 6.255), but the form of the term in Homer is xenos, rather than xenos as here. Further, the text must be emended from poimenothi to poimenophi in order to be translated as "as a shepherd" (cf. Gen 26:20). The corruption may be more deep-seated.

b. The MSS read atereē. "improvident," rather than atereē, "stubborn." The term "improvident" may seem more appropriate for Hamor and Sychem in view of their eventual death and because of their willingness to undergo circumcision. However, "stubborn" is also appropriate in view of their determination to obtain Dinah in marriage and is to be preferred since atereē, "improvident," is not found in Homer or the later epic poets, whereas atereē, "stubborn," is properly Homeric.

c. The text appears to be corrupt here. The MSS read neegenēs, "newborn," which is the proper epic form but which does not fit the meter of the line. The editor Mras has adopted the emendation to neigenēs, "newborn," which fits the meter but whose form is non-epic and whose meaning is not clearly appropriate. The emendation to xynegenēs, "kindred," is possible, but the clause would then be redundant, since the preceding line states that he was a "cousin to him." A possible emendation is gaigenēs, "from the land," i.e. native; the clause would then explain why Laban ruled over Syria.

d. The emendation of epiprepton, "conspicuous," to epistrepton, "admirable," which has been adopted by Mras, has been followed.
welcomed him and gave him a certain portion of the land.\(^b\) Jacob himself tilled the land; his sons, eleven in number, herded sheep; and his daughter, Dinah, and his wives worked with wool. And Dinah, still a virgin, came into Shechem when there was a festival,\(^c\) since she wished to see the city. But when Sychem the son of Hamor saw her, he loved her; and after seizing her as his own, he carried her off and ravished her. Then, coming back again with his father to Jacob, he asked for her in the partnership of marriage. Jacob said that he would not give her until all the inhabitants of Shechem were circumcised and became Jews,\(^d\) Hamor said that he would persuade them. Concerning the necessity of their being circumcised, Jacob says,\(^e\) 

For this is not allowed to Hebrews to bring sons-in-law or daughters-in-law into their house from elsewhere but, rather, whoever boasts\(^f\) that he is of the same race.

**Fragment 5** Alexander Polyhistor, "On the Jews," in Eusebius, "Praeparatio Evangelica" 9.22.7:

Then, a little below he (i.e. Jacob) says concerning circumcision,\(^a\)

Once (God) himself, when he led the noble Abraham out of his native land, from heaven called upon the man and all his family to strip off the flesh (i.e. the foreskin), and therefore he accomplished it. The command remains unshaken, since God himself spoke it.

**Fragment 6** Alexander Polyhistor, "On the Jews," in Eusebius, "Praeparatio Evangelica" 9.22.8–9:

As Hamor went into the city and encouraged his subjects to be circumcised,\(^a\) one of the sons of Jacob—Simeon by name—decided to kill Hamor and Sychem,\(^b\) since he was unwilling to bear in a civil manner the violent attack upon his sister.\(^c\) When he had decided this, he shared it with his brother. Seizing him, he urged him to agree to the act by producing an oracle which said that God

\(^a\) Since the verb *exeuchomai*, "to boast aloud," does not occur in Homer, we should probably read here two words: the preposition *ex*, "of," and the verb *euchomai*, "to boast aloud," although the editor Mras has preferred the verb *exeuchomai*.

\(^b\) It is certainly not given greater prominence; he receives the heavenly derivation of the priesthood and the Levites from Jacob himself tilled the land; his sons, eleven in number, herded sheep; and his daughter, Dinah, and his wives worked with wool. And Dinah, still a virgin, came into Shechem when there was a festival, since she wished to see the city. But when Sychem the son of Hamor saw her, he loved her; and after seizing her as his own, he carried her off and ravished her. Then, coming back again with his father to Jacob, he asked for her in the partnership of marriage. Jacob said that he would not give her until all the inhabitants of Shechem were circumcised and became Jews, Hamor said that he would persuade them. Concerning the necessity of their being circumcised, Jacob says, For this is not allowed to Hebrews to bring sons-in-law or daughters-in-law into their house from elsewhere but, rather, whoever boasts that he is of the same race.

**Fragment 5** (22.7) a. Alexander Polyhistor has apparently omitted several ll. at this point. In those ll. Theodotus probably pointed to the law of circumcision as the reason why the Hebrews were not allowed to intermarry with other ethnic groups. In the ll. of paragraph 7 as in paragraph 6 Jacob is evidently intended as the speaker.

**Fragment 6** (22.8–9) a. In this paragraph Alexander Polyhistor again summarizes the poem of Theodotus. Two important items, which are present in Gen 34 but missing in the paraphrase of Alexander, are that the males of Shechem were in fact circumcised and that Simeon and Levi attacked the city while they were recovering. It is possible that Theodotus included these motifs and that Alexander merely omitted them. However, the embarrassment of later Jewish tradition over the circumcision and then slaughter of the Shechemites makes it possible that Theodotus excluded these motifs. Jub 30 and Josephus, *Ant* 1.21.1, 337–40 omit the actual circumcision; in TLLevi 6:3 Levi counsels against circumcising the Shechemites but then records that they were in fact circumcised (6.6). See, further, the introduction.

b. In Gen 34:13 the sons of Jacob speak with Hamor treacherously by demanding circumcision while plotting the slaughter. Theodotus avoids the treachery by having Jacob encourage circumcision (F. 5) and by having Simeon decide by himself to kill the Shechemites.

c. In Gen 34:25 both Simeon and Levi are referred to, but neither is given emphasis. In Jub 30 the role of Levi is emphasized and also the derivation of the priesthood and the Levites from him because of his slaughter of the Shechemites (30:17–22). Also in TLLevi 5f. the role of Levi is given greater prominence; he receives the heavenly
had determined\textsuperscript{a} to give ten peoples\textsuperscript{e} to the descendants of Abraham. Simeon says the following to Levi:

For I have indeed learned the word from God, for of old he said that he would give ten peoples to the children of Abraham.


God sent this thought into them because those in Shechem were impious. He (i.e. Theodotus) says,

God smote the inhabitants of Shechem, for they did not honor whoever came to them, whether evil or noble.\textsuperscript{a} Nor did they determine rights or laws throughout the city. Rather, deadly works were their care.\textsuperscript{b}


Therefore, Levi and Simeon came fully armed into the city. At first they slew those they happened to meet, and then they killed Hamor and Sychem. Concerning their slaying, he says the following:\textsuperscript{a}

Thus then Simeon rushed upon Hamor himself and struck him upon the head; he seized his throat in his left hand and then let it go still gasping its last breath,\textsuperscript{b} since there was another task to do. At that time Levi,\textsuperscript{c} also irresistible in might, seized Sychem by the hair; the latter grasped his knees and raged unspeakably. Levi struck the middle of his collarbone; the sharp sword entered his inward parts through the chest; and his life thereupon\textsuperscript{a} left his bodily frame. When the other brothers learned of their deed, they assisted them and pillaged the city; and after rescuing their sister, they carried her off with the prisoners to their father's quarters.

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. Gen 34:25f.
  \item b. The charges against the Shechemites are further specified in Homeric language as not determining "rights or laws" and caring for "deadly works"; see Odyssey 9.215 and Iliad 1:518.
  \item c. Gen 34:26–29
  \item d. Later Jewish tradition was evidently concerned to show that the killing of the Shechemites was not simply an act of revenge but was in accord with the will of God. See Jdt 9:2; Jub 30:6f.; and TLevi 5:1–5 and 6:8, 11.
  \item e. The reference to give ten peoples to the descendants of Abraham is found in Gen 15:18–21. Freudenthal (Alexander Polyhistor, pp. 99f.) was unaware of the biblical reference and thus suggested that the notion was related to the idea of the ten lost tribes of Israel; this suggestion seems unnecessary.
\end{itemize}

\textbf{Fragment 7 (22.9) a. Gen 34 has no mention of the impiety of the Shechemites. Theodotus' charge that the Shechemites "did not honor whoever came to them, whether evil or noble," is shared by TLevi 6:8–10, where it is charged that the Shechemites also sought to attack Sarah and Rebecca, that they persecuted Abraham when he was a stranger, and that they so acted against all strangers. To some extent the motivation for this charge may be to exculpate the sons of Jacob from merely seeming to have performed an act of revenge.

b. The charges against the Shechemites are further specified in Homeric language as not determining "rights or laws" and caring for "deadly works"; see Odyssey 9.215 and Iliad 1:518.

c. Gen 34:25f. does not specify which of the sons of Jacob slew Hamor and which slew Sychem. In accord with TLevi 6:4, Theodotus states that it is Simeon who slays Hamor and Levi who slays Sychem. In contrast to Theodotus, however, TLevi has Levi slay Sychem first and then Simeon slay Hamor. Again, the emphasis on Levi in TLevi probably indicates a priestly or Levitical origin for the testament, and the contrary emphasis on Simeon in Theodotus probably indicates a different origin or sympathy; see F. 6.

d. The MSS read \textit{authis}, "again"; the editor Mras has adopted the emendation \textit{euthys}, "immediately." The more appropriate emendation seems to be to the epic form \textit{authi}, "forthwith," i.e. thereupon. See Iliad 5.296.