

# Rethinking Rewritten Scripture

Composition and Exegesis  
in the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts

By  
Molly M. Zahn



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON  
2011

## CHAPTER ONE

### INTRODUCTION

The five Qumran manuscripts labeled 4QReworked Pentateuch (4Q158; 4Q364–367) have come to function in the last several years as a connecting link between two scholarly discourses that had previously been carried on largely independently of one another. On the one hand, the finds in the caves surrounding Khirbet Qumran had revolutionized the discussion of the textual history of the Hebrew Bible: nonsectarian, Hebrew manuscripts containing text types previously known only from the Samaritan or Greek versions—and others that departed from all known versions—indicated that the text of the Hebrew Bible was far from fixed in the final centuries before the turn of the millennium, but existed in a pluriformity scarcely imagined earlier.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, prompted by the discovery and publication of texts such as the Genesis Apocryphon and the Temple Scroll, other scholars were discussing the phenomenon of ‘rewritten Scripture,’ in which Second Temple authors expressed exegetical and theological opinions by presenting a new version of scriptural narratives and laws.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. Eugene Ulrich, “The Text of the Hebrew Scriptures at the Time of Hillel and Jesus,” in *Congress Volume Basel 2001* (ed. Andre Lemaire; VTSup 92; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 85–108; Michael Segal, “The Text of the Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Materia Giudaica* 12 (2007): 5–20; Emanuel Tov, “The Many Forms of Hebrew Scripture: Reflections in Light of the LXX and 4QReworked Pentateuch,” in *From Qumran to Aleppo* (ed. Armin Lange et al.; FRLANT 230; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009), 11–28.

<sup>2</sup> The term ‘rewritten Bible’ was coined by Geza Vermes in 1961; see idem, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies* (2nd ed.; StPB 4; Leiden: Brill, 1973). Since Vermes’s publication, there has been much debate over the meaning and proper application of the term. For recent overviews, see Moshe J. Bernstein, “‘Rewritten Bible’: A Generic Category Which Has Outlived Its Usefulness?,” *Textus* 22 (2005): 169–96; Anders Klostergaard Petersen, “Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon—Genre, Textual Strategy, or Canonical Anachronism?,” in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. Anthony Hilhorst et al.; JSJSup 122; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 285–306. In the last decade or so, the term ‘rewritten Bible’ has tended to be replaced by ‘rewritten Scripture,’ in recognition of the fact that, at the time these texts were composed, there was no ‘Bible’ in the modern sense of a fixed collection of fixed forms of certain books. See e.g. James C. VanderKam, “The Wording of Biblical Citations in Some Rewritten Scriptural Works,” in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (ed. Edward

Onto the scene came the 4QReworked Pentateuch (4QRP) manuscripts in 1994, the year that 4Q364–367 were published in DJD 13.<sup>3</sup> (4Q158 was published in DJD 5 by John Allegro, but had received virtually no attention.)<sup>4</sup> These fragmentary manuscripts, all dating from the first century B.C.E., fit only uneasily into existing categories.<sup>5</sup> On the one hand, they shared many features with texts classified as ‘rewritten Scripture’: they contained expansions, rearrangements, paraphrases, and other types of changes vis-à-vis known versions of the pentateuchal text. On the other hand, in some ways they seemed much closer to the Pentateuch than any of the examples of ‘rewritten Scripture’: many fragments contained simply the text as known from elsewhere, with little or no variation. Unlike the Temple Scroll, Jubilees, or the Genesis Apocryphon, these texts showed no hint of a new narrative setting: no new speaker or claim to constitute divine revelation. Therefore, although the official editors initially labeled the five 4QRP MSS as copies of an extrabiblical interpretive composition (‘rewritten Scripture’), other scholars, and ultimately the editors themselves, have argued that the manuscripts are in fact biblical manuscripts: versions of the Pentateuch expanded beyond what anyone had seen or thought possible before, but versions of the Pentateuch nonetheless.<sup>6</sup>

In their position at this juncture between two discourses—which, rightly, have begun to merge—the 4QRP MSS constitute critical evidence relevant to a number of issues. These include the status of the pentateuchal text in the late Second Temple period, the relationship (both intended and perceived) between ‘rewritten Scripture’ texts and the Scripture they rewrite, the nature of scribal activity in this period, and the history of exegesis. Yet the 4QRP MSS have not been subjected to a thorough, detailed analysis from the point of view of the specific techniques and strategies that they use to rework the pentateuchal text. This study will fill that gap, providing the foundation for a better

---

D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov; London: British Library, 2002), 41–56, at pp. 42–43; Petersen, “Rewritten Bible,” 286–88.

<sup>3</sup> Emanuel Tov and Sidnie White (Crawford), “Reworked Pentateuch,” in *Qumran Cave 4, VIII* (by Harold Attridge et al.; DJD 13; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 187–351.

<sup>4</sup> John Allegro, *Qumrân Cave 4, I* (DJD 5; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 1–6.

<sup>5</sup> There is no clear evidence upon which to date the 4QRP MSS other than paleography, which of course means that the composition(s) contained in these MSS could be older than the first century B.C.E. For the paleographical details, see John Strugnell, “Notes en Marge du Volume V des ‘Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan,’” *RevQ* 7 (1970): 163–276, at p. 168; Tov and White (Crawford), DJD 13:201, 260, 336, 346.

<sup>6</sup> See below, pp. 4–6.

understanding both of the manuscripts themselves and of their impact on the broader issues just mentioned.

### 1.1 BACKGROUND

The study and publication of what are now known as the five 4QRP mss began, as mentioned above, with Allegro's publication of 4Q158, under the title 4QBiblical Paraphrase, in DJD 5 (1968). This edition, typical of those in DJD 5, is inexact and contains almost no commentary. Although Allegro's desire to get the Scrolls published and into the hands of scholars as quickly as possible is admirable,<sup>7</sup> one wonders whether the utter lack of contextualization was one reason the text received almost no attention for the next thirty years. In any case, the edition contains many errors, some but not all of which were noted by John Strugnell in a review article published in 1970.<sup>8</sup> Because of the difficulties with the existing edition, my own transcription of 4Q158 is provided in Appendix 1.<sup>9</sup>

4Q158 began to receive more attention when it was identified by Emanuel Tov and Sidnie White (Crawford) as another manuscript copy of the composition they had labeled 4QReworked Pentateuch, extant in the four manuscripts 4Q364–367, which they were editing for DJD 13. The editors characterized this composition as an interpretive work which “contained a running text of the Pentateuch interspersed with exegetical additions and omissions.”<sup>10</sup> Although physical overlaps between the five manuscripts are minimal, Tov and Crawford argued that they “share important characteristics” and therefore should be regarded as multiple copies of a single composition.<sup>11</sup>

Two aspects in particular of Tov and Crawford's characterization of the five 4QRP mss have drawn criticism from other scholars. First is the identification of the five manuscripts as copies of a single composition.

---

<sup>7</sup> See the intriguing account of Allegro's conflicts with other members of the first Scrolls publication team and his frustration over the slow pace of publication in the recent biography by his daughter: Judith Anne Brown, *John Marco Allegro: Maverick of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005).

<sup>8</sup> Strugnell, “Notes en Marge.”

<sup>9</sup> A completely new edition of 4Q158 is being prepared by Prof. Moshe Bernstein and myself for inclusion in a forthcoming revision of the DJD 5 materials, edited by Prof. Bernstein and Prof. George Brooke.

<sup>10</sup> Tov and White (Crawford), DJD 13:191.

<sup>11</sup> Tov and White (Crawford), DJD 13:191.

The few physical overlaps between the manuscripts are so minor as to be virtually useless: in all of them the overlap occurs in a section where the manuscripts are following the scriptural text closely, and there are only two cases where any two of the 4QRP MSS share a unique reading against all other known witnesses. They are very minor: 4Q364 17 3 and 4Q365 8a–b 1 both read  $\text{הארון}$  where the Masoretic Text (MT) and the Samaritan Pentateuch (SP) have  $\text{ארון}$  in Exod 26:34; and 4Q158 1–2 7 and 4Q364 5b ii 13 both read  $\text{ויאמר}$  where the MT, SP, and the Septuagint (G) have  $\text{ויקרא}$  in Gen 32:31.<sup>12</sup> Several scholars have argued that this is insufficient textual evidence for regarding the manuscripts as copies of the same composition, and have rejected the editors' appeal to shared characteristics like exegetical additions and omissions as overly vague. Michael Segal and Moshe Bernstein both argue that the various manuscripts do not all deal with the scriptural text in the same way, and therefore the five manuscripts should not be regarded as copies of the same composition.<sup>13</sup> George Brooke, taking a different approach, has shown that, in cases where there is an overlap or near-overlap between two fragments, they can almost never be reconstructed as having the same text. He therefore suggests that it would be more appropriate to refer to the five manuscripts as 4QRP A–E, indicating related but not identical compositions, than to regard them as copies of the same work, 4QRP<sup>a–e</sup>.<sup>14</sup>

The other major point on which Tov and Crawford have been criticized is their characterization of 4QRP as an extrabiblical, non-authoritative text. Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam have both suggested that the types of exegetical changes evident in the 4QRP MSS are precisely those that characterize the still-fluid *biblical* text in the Second Temple period.<sup>15</sup> Michael Segal has espoused a variant form of

<sup>12</sup> Tov and White (Crawford), DJD 13:188, 190. For more on the latter reading, see section 2.1.1.

<sup>13</sup> Moshe J. Bernstein, "Pentateuchal Interpretation at Qumran," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 1:128–59, at p. 134; idem, "Rewritten Bible," 196; Michael Segal, "4QReworked Pentateuch or 4QPentateuch?," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After Their Discovery* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman et al.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society/Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000), 391–99, at pp. 396–97.

<sup>14</sup> George J. Brooke, "4Q158: Reworked Pentateuch<sup>a</sup> or Reworked Pentateuch A?," *DSD* 8 (2001): 219–41.

<sup>15</sup> Eugene Ulrich, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Text," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. Peter W. Flint and James

this position, arguing that 4Q364–367 most likely represent biblical texts, but that 4Q158 belongs to the category of rewritten Scripture.<sup>16</sup>

In the past several years, both Tov and Crawford have changed their initial positions, such that both now accept the argument that the 4QRP mss may well represent expanded biblical texts. Tov argues in recent publications that the treatment of the biblical text in the 4QRP mss is so similar to what we find in expansive biblical texts like the Samaritan Pentateuch and some parts of the Septuagint that 4QRP must be considered “Hebrew Scripture.” He notes that, if texts like the pre-SP manuscripts<sup>17</sup> and the Hebrew *Vorlagen* for G were considered authoritative Scripture, it is highly likely that 4QRP was considered authoritative as well.<sup>18</sup> Crawford is somewhat more cautious. She acknowledges that at least some of the 4QRP mss “were meant by the scribes that prepared them to be read as regular pentateuchal texts,” but notes that we have little clear evidence that they were considered authoritative by any particular group.<sup>19</sup> Even within the Qumran community,

---

C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 1:79–100, at p. 88; idem, “Text of the Hebrew Scriptures,” 102–3; James C. VanderKam, “Questions of Canon Viewed through the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Canon Debate* (ed. Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrikson, 2002), 91–109, at pp. 96–100. See also Armin Lange, “The Status of the Biblical Texts in the Qumran Corpus and the Canonical Process,” in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (ed. Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov; London: British Library, 2002), 21–30, at p. 27.

<sup>16</sup> Segal, “4QReworked Pentateuch,” 394–95.

<sup>17</sup> I use the term ‘pre-SP’ throughout this study to refer to those manuscripts that contain many of the same features as SP but lack the explicitly sectarian elements, such as the Samaritan version of the tenth commandment, which prescribes worship upon Mt. Gerizim. A text similar to these pre-SP mss must have served as the *Vorlage* for SP, whose editor is now known to have made relatively minor changes to an existing Hebrew text-type. On this issue, see further the introduction to ch. 4. With the term ‘pre-SP’ (instead of the older term ‘proto-SP’), I mean to indicate the textual affiliation of these mss with SP, without implying that there is anything specifically ‘Samaritan’ about them.

<sup>18</sup> See Emanuel Tov, “3 Kingdoms Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions,” in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. Anthony Hilhorst et al.; JSJSup 122; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 345–66, at pp. 365–66; idem, “Many Forms,” 26. Unlike Crawford, who accepts Brooke’s argument concerning the relation of the five manuscripts to one another, Tov nowhere in these newer articles addresses the issue of whether the 4QRP mss represent a single composition, and continues to talk about 4QRP as if it were a single text. For Crawford’s position, see Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 39.

<sup>19</sup> Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 56–57. Crawford’s discussion of the status of the 4QRP mss in this book focuses exclusively on 4Q364 and 4Q365. However, her arguments here are not substantially different from those made in an earlier article regarding

Crawford argues, we cannot be sure that any of the 4QRP mss were accepted as a copy of the Pentateuch.<sup>20</sup> At the same time as Tov and Crawford have changed their positions, however, their original stance—that the 4QRP mss represent something other than copies of the Pentateuch—continues to find some support among scholars.<sup>21</sup>

---

4QRP as a whole; Sidnie White Crawford, “The ‘Rewritten’ Bible at Qumran: A Look at Three Texts,” *ErIsr* 26 (1999): 1–8 (Eng.). A position similar to Crawford’s is presented by Daniel K. Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 8; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 111.

<sup>20</sup> Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 57. The presence of these manuscripts at Qumran naturally raises questions about their origins and relation to the Qumran community, which in turn may have implications for the question of their authority for that community. The paleographic date of all five mss in the first century B.C.E., along with the fact that the three best-preserved mss (4Q158, 364, and 365) are written in what Tov has termed the “Qumran scribal practice,” suggests that at least some of the mss were produced at Qumran; see Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 261–73. As noted above, this does not mean that members of the Qumran community were actually responsible for the distinctive features of the manuscripts; that is, the manuscripts could be copies of earlier revisions of the Pentateuch (or copies of earlier extrabiblical compositions, depending upon one’s perspective). If the manuscripts are subsequent copies of already-existing texts, then it would appear that someone within the Qumran community regarded these texts as important enough to be recopied, suggesting that at least someone accepted them as copies of the Pentateuch or as otherwise authoritative. There is very little evidence to go on, but two factors might point to an earlier origin for the 4QRP texts than the paleographical date of the manuscripts. First, none of the unique readings in the 4QRP mss seem to reflect the ideology of the Qumran community. (Roger Nam’s identification of two minor variants as betraying sectarian motivations fails to convince; see idem, “How to Rewrite Torah: The Case for Proto-Sectarian Ideology in the *Reworked Pentateuch* (4QRP),” *RevQ* 23 (2007): 153–65.) It might be expected that, if the Qumran sectarians had produced these texts, they may have inserted more of their own ideology into them in the course of their rewriting. Second, two of the 4QRP mss have points of substantial overlap with other Second Temple compositions: 4Q364 expands the episode of Jacob’s departure for Haran (Gen 28:1–5) in a manner similar to Jubilees, and 4Q365 shows close connections to the Temple Scroll in frag. 23 (the wood offering) and in 4Q365a frag. 2 (instructions for a Temple court). (On these cases see sections 3.1.1 and 3.2.1 below. I regard 4Q365a as part of 4Q365.) The precise relationship between the versions of the Jacob story in Jubilees and in 4Q364 is unclear. In the case of the 4Q365 materials, however, a literary relationship with the Temple Scroll seems very likely. Given that the Temple Scroll seems to present a more developed version of the text in the case of its overlaps with 4Q365a 2, it appears more probable that TS drew upon 4Q365 or a text very like it rather than the other way around (see below, ch. 3, n. 56). If this is true, then the version of the Pentateuch represented by 4Q365 must have been produced prior to the composition of TS, which probably occurred in the mid-second century B.C.E. (for this date, see ch. 5, n. 2).

<sup>21</sup> See especially Moshe J. Bernstein, “What Has Happened to the Laws? The Treatment of Legal Material in 4QReworked Pentateuch,” *DSD* 15 (2008): 24–49, at pp. 48–49. Especially because of the ways the 4QRP mss deal with legal material, including

All this discussion has certainly advanced our understanding of the 4QRP mss, but several key issues remain insufficiently explored. For instance, Brooke has demonstrated convincingly on the basis of the physical evidence of the manuscripts that the five 4QRP mss should not be considered copies of the same work.<sup>22</sup> But what of the claim of Bernstein and Segal, that qualitative differences in exegetical technique separate the manuscripts from one another? This claim has not yet been accompanied by detailed analysis of the techniques and purposes of scriptural reworking in each of the five manuscripts. Segal has published an article examining the reworking of Scripture in 4Q158, but there has been no similar investigation of 4Q364–367.<sup>23</sup> In general, although much has been made of the rewriting of Scripture that goes on in the 4QRP mss, treatment of this issue has been short on detail. Segal and Bernstein offer in-depth analyses of the subsections that they treat in recent articles (Segal’s on 4Q158 and Bernstein’s on the legal material in all five mss).<sup>24</sup> Yet two recent monographs focusing on rewritten Scripture, each of which devotes a chapter to the 4QRP texts, address only a few of the most well-known additions and alterations preserved in them, and shed little light on the full range of ways in which these manuscripts rewrite Scripture.<sup>25</sup> Issues also arise in relation to the now quite popular position that the 4QRP mss represent copies of the Pentateuch.

## 1.2 A ‘CONTINUUM’ OF SCRIPTURAL REWORKING

The observation made by Ulrich, VanderKam, and others that there is a fundamental similarity between the textual reworking evident in some expanded copies of biblical books and the reworking evident in the 4QRP mss is insightful and correct. However, that observation

---

the possibility that major sections of biblical law were omitted, Bernstein hesitates to label any of the 4QRP mss as pentateuchal. He does, however, recognize the alternative as a possibility, and concedes that 4Q364 “might very well be” pentateuchal, because of its relatively conservative rewriting. (On rewriting in 4Q364, see further below, sections 3.1 and 3.5.) Following Bernstein is Torleif Elgvin, “Sixty Years of Qumran Research: Implications for Biblical Studies,” *SEÅ* 73 (2008): 7–28, at p. 16.

<sup>22</sup> See n. 14 above.

<sup>23</sup> Michael Segal, “Biblical Exegesis in 4Q158: Techniques and Genre,” *Textus* 19 (1998): 45–62.

<sup>24</sup> See above, nn. 21 and 23.

<sup>25</sup> Falk, *Parabiblical Texts*, 107–19; Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 39–59.

in itself does not prove that the 4QRP mss were simply copies of the Pentateuch. Instead, it leads to a host of related considerations.<sup>26</sup>

Stress on the similarity between the methods of reworking in copies of biblical books and in 4QRP has been accompanied by the detection of essentially the same methods in other texts, texts which are usually categorized as rewritten Scripture (e.g. Jubilees, the Temple Scroll, and the Genesis Apocryphon). This has led several scholars to postulate the existence of a sort of ‘continuum’ or ‘spectrum’ upon which the various texts that rework Scripture can be plotted, from texts that depart relatively infrequently and in more minor ways from the scriptural text as known from elsewhere to those that make frequent, major changes.<sup>27</sup> Thus, for the Pentateuch, the pre-SP texts from Qumran and SP itself, with their relatively restrained changes, would be close to one end of the continuum, the 4QRP mss would be somewhat farther along, Jubilees and the Temple Scroll farther along still, and texts like the Genesis Apocryphon close to the other end.<sup>28</sup>

Anyone with even a casual familiarity with the contents of these texts is likely to perceive the intuitive appeal of such a continuum. While its heuristic value is clear, however, this model also presents some problems. To begin with, the intuitive plotting of points along the spectrum has not been accompanied by the kind of study that would provide empirical support. Such study would involve a thorough examination of the ways in which each text reworks Scripture, and then a comparison of the texts in order to determine the similarities and differences between them. For all the work done on these texts, systematic investigations of this type that compare the methods and goals of scriptural reworking in each text to those of other texts

<sup>26</sup> For an in-depth discussion of whether the 4QRP mss can be identified conclusively as copies of the Pentateuch, see Molly M. Zahn, “The Problem of Characterizing the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts: Bible, Rewritten Bible, or None of the Above?,” *DSD* 15 (2008): 315–39.

<sup>27</sup> George J. Brooke, “The Rewritten Law, Prophets and Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible,” in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (ed. Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov; London: British Library, 2002), 31–40; VanderKam, “Wording of Biblical Citations,” 46; idem, “Questions of Canon,” 99, 108; Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 13–14. The idea of a continuum of reworking seems to be endorsed more implicitly by Petersen, “Rewritten Bible.” It should be emphasized that Brooke and VanderKam do not explore the idea at length. Crawford, on the other hand, returns to the concept at several points (see n. 31 below).

<sup>28</sup> This characterization is similar to that of Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 13–14.

on the spectrum have not yet been carried out.<sup>29</sup> We still lack an accurate understanding of the methods by which Scripture was reworked in the late Second Temple period, of the relation between those methods and the particular theological or exegetical issues addressed by a given reworking, and of how to measure or evaluate appropriately the distance of a given work from its scriptural source text. A sustained comparative investigation is necessary to answer these questions.

Second, insufficient attention has been paid to the question of how the idea of the continuum relates to the problem—most salient for the 4QRP MSS—of determining whether a work was intended as ‘biblical’; that is, as a copy or new edition of a biblical book, or as ‘rewritten Scripture’: a new work that draws on one or more biblical books.<sup>30</sup> In her new monograph, Crawford repeatedly notes that there is a point

---

<sup>29</sup> Key publications on SP, the pre-SP texts, and the Temple Scroll are cited in chs. 4 and 5 below; see especially ch. 4, nn. 1, 5, 6; and ch. 5, nn. 2–4, 8. Important studies of the Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees that focus on issues of textual reworking include Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20): A Commentary* (3rd ed.; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 2004), 40–43; Moshe J. Bernstein, “Re-Arrangement, Anticipation and Harmonization as Exegetical Features in the Genesis Apocryphon,” *DSD* 3 (1996): 37–57; J.T.A.G.M. van Ruiten, “The Rewriting of Exodus 24:12–18 in Jubilees 1:1–4,” *BN* 79 (1995): 25–29; idem, “The Relationship Between Exod 31,12–17 and Jubilees 2,1.17–33,” in *Studies in the Book of Exodus: Redaction—Reception—Interpretation* (ed. Marc Vervenne; BETL 126; Leuven: Peeters, 1996), 567–75; idem, *Primaeval History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis 1–11 in the Book of Jubilees* (JSJSup 66; Leiden: Brill, 2000). The studies of biblical interpretation in Jubilees by Endres and VanderKam focus primarily on interpretive method, but do make mention of some rewriting techniques as well (for the distinction, see section 1.3.1 below): John C. Endres, *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees* (CBQMS 18; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association, 1987), 196–225; James C. VanderKam, “Biblical Interpretation in 1 Enoch and Jubilees,” in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (ed. James H. Charlesworth and Craig A. Evans; JSPSup 14; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 96–125.

<sup>30</sup> Generally I agree that the terms ‘Scripture’ and ‘scriptural’ are more appropriate than ‘Bible’ and ‘biblical’ in reference to texts of the Second Temple period, since there was no fixed canon of Scripture at this point and the forms of the particular books that were later included in the Hebrew Bible were still somewhat fluid (see n. 15 above). However, the term ‘scriptural’ becomes problematic in discussions about whether a particular manuscript represents a copy or edition of a book that later became part of the Hebrew Bible, because even a rewritten text that is intended as a new literary work (like Jubilees or the Temple Scroll) may have been ‘scriptural’ in the sense that it may have been regarded as sacred and authoritative. The term ‘scriptural’ does not get at the *literary* issue of whether a rewritten work should be considered a copy of the book or books it rewrites or a new work altogether. Therefore, I occasionally use the term ‘biblical’ to refer to a *copy or edition of a book that later became part of the Hebrew Bible*. The term should not be taken to imply anything about the status of the canon in the last two centuries B.C.E. For a fuller explanation of the issues, see Zahn, “4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts,” 317–19.

on the spectrum “in which the scribal manipulation of the base text is so extensive that a recognizably new work is created.”<sup>31</sup> In this conception, which others also appear to share, there is a quantity of change or difference from the known scriptural text beyond which a work can no longer be considered ‘Bible’ and must be termed ‘rewritten Bible’ (or ‘rewritten Scripture’).<sup>32</sup> Again, this position makes intuitive sense, but lacks precision: how much difference is ‘too much’? Does the *type* of difference matter? Michael Segal has argued persuasively that it is not the sheer amount of difference from the base text that qualifies a work as ‘rewritten Scripture,’ but rather specific types of changes: a new narrative setting, a new speaker, a new scope. In his view, ancient editors used specific literary techniques in order to indicate to the reader that, despite sometimes pervasive reuse of a biblical source, their work was not intended as a copy or new edition of the book(s) they rewrote, but as a new literary entity.<sup>33</sup>

This distinction between *quantity* of difference and *quality* of difference is critical to a proper understanding of the 4QRP MSS, as well as other similar works. If we classify the 4QRP MSS as copies of the Pentateuch, it should not be primarily because of their closeness to the pentateuchal text relative to other works, but because there is no *literary* or formal indication that they are anything other than pentateuchal. Conversely, if we classify the Temple Scroll or Jubilees as non-biblical (though quite probably scriptural!) compositions, it should not be primarily because of the amount of difference between them and the text of the Pentateuch, but because each has been given a new literary setting and a new literary voice.<sup>34</sup>

Thus while the idea of a continuum or spectrum of scriptural reworking is a helpful one, it has yet to be fully fleshed out. Besides a

<sup>31</sup> Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 14. See also p. 62 and especially p. 86: “[T]hey [sc. TS and Jubilees] have both departed from their pentateuchal base texts *far enough* to be termed separate works.” (My emphasis.)

<sup>32</sup> Both Moshe Bernstein and, following him, James VanderKam speak of a “border” (albeit poorly marked) “between biblical texts and biblical interpretation”; Bernstein, “Pentateuchal Interpretation at Qumran,” 134. See also VanderKam, “Wording of Biblical Citations,” 46.

<sup>33</sup> Michael Segal, “Between Bible and Rewritten Bible,” in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. Matthias Henze; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 10–29.

<sup>34</sup> Both works are depicted as divine revelation to Moses on Mt. Sinai; in the Temple Scroll, God speaks to Moses directly; in Jubilees, the divine word is mediated through the Angel of the Presence. See Segal, “Between Bible and Rewritten Bible,” 21–23.

fuller investigation of the texts involved so as to plot more accurately the points on this continuum, more consideration is needed of the relationship between methods of reworking and the intended status of the resulting composition. The previous paragraph indicates that we cannot simply draw a line on a quantitative scale beyond which it is no longer possible for a rewritten text to be considered a copy of a biblical book. However, this does not mean that there is no connection between the methods by which a text reworks Scripture and the status intended for that text. Perhaps particular types of changes occur with particular frequency in particular types of works; perhaps there is no correlation. Part of my task in what follows will be to gather the data to attempt an answer to these questions.

### 1.3 THE APPROACH OF THIS STUDY

In what follows I will begin to address some of the difficulties noted above. This study consists of a detailed analysis of the ways Scripture is reworked in 4Q158 (chapter 2) and the remaining 4QRP MSS (chapter 3), accompanied by a comparison of the techniques found there with those evidenced by the Samaritan Pentateuch and the pre-Samaritan texts from Qumran on the one hand (chapter 4), and by the Temple Scroll (TS) on the other (chapter 5). I devote a separate chapter to 4Q158 because its relatively small size but relatively extensive reworking of its pentateuchal *Vorlage* allows for a richer analysis than is possible for the very large 4Q364 and 4Q365 or the poorly-preserved 4Q366 and 4Q367.<sup>35</sup> The comparative chapters 4 and 5 are meant to provide context for the scriptural reworking attested in the 4QRP MSS, so as to begin working toward a more comprehensive understanding of the role such reworking plays in Second Temple texts. These particular texts suggest themselves as points of comparison both because they lie on either side of the 4QRP MSS in the ‘spectrum’ of rewritten texts described above and because each has frequently been compared to or discussed alongside the 4QRP MSS. In my analysis, I will focus primarily on the details and method of the reworking itself—what I call ‘compositional technique’—but will also consider the motivation

---

<sup>35</sup> See further the introduction to ch. 2.

behind particular changes—the interpretive decision(s) that led the author to make a given change.<sup>36</sup>

Because the focus of my project is on the methods and goals of textual reworking in the 4QRP MSS, I will pay relatively little attention to the question of whether the 4QRP MSS are copies of the Pentateuch or represent new compositions, though I will return to this issue in the Conclusion. In the current state of research, I do not believe a definitive decision can be made regarding the status of these texts.<sup>37</sup> However, I find the literary features mentioned above—the fact that the 4QRP MSS preserve no voice or setting different from that of the Pentateuch—quite compelling evidence that these MSS were originally copies of the Pentateuch. This issue still requires further study, but in light of the work that has been done to date I am inclined to regard the 4QRP MSS as most likely pentateuchal.<sup>38</sup>

### 1.3.1 *Compositional Technique and Exegesis*

I use the term ‘compositional technique’ to refer to the procedure by which a given verse or pericope is reworked in the texts I examine. A compositional technique is a specific way of manipulating or altering the base text, such as addition of new text, rearrangement, or paraphrase. Below, I will lay out a basic typology of compositional techniques, which I will employ in my analysis of the 4QRP MSS, the pre-SP texts and SP, and the Temple Scroll. First, however, it is necessary to distinguish ‘compositional technique’ from the terms ‘exegesis’ and ‘exegetical technique,’ which have often been used in its stead.

Scholars of rewritten Scripture frequently refer to alterations of the scriptural source as ‘exegesis’ and the various methods by which this is accomplished as ‘exegetical techniques.’<sup>39</sup> This terminology, how-

<sup>36</sup> For clarification of the term ‘compositional technique’ and the reasons for separating textual reworking per se from the interpretive processes underlying it, see section 1.3.1.

<sup>37</sup> See Zahn, “4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts.”

<sup>38</sup> For some suggestions regarding the direction future research might take in order to answer this question more definitively, see section 6.2.3 in the Conclusion.

<sup>39</sup> E.g. Brooke, “4Q158,” 224; Bernstein, “Re-Arrangement,” 39; Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 52 and elsewhere; Segal, “Biblical Exegesis,” 45; Emanuel Tov, “Rewritten Bible Compositions and Biblical Manuscripts, with Special Attention to the Samaritan Pentateuch,” *DSD* 5 (1998): 334–54, at p. 334. This understanding also lies behind the generally broad use of the term ‘inner-biblical exegesis’ to refer to a variety of types of deliberate reuse of one biblical text by another; see the discussion (and the

ever, conflates two different aspects of textual rewriting: the decision that a text should say something other than what it currently says—an act of interpretation—and the reformulation of the text to reflect that interpretation. The interpretive decision as to what a text means is fundamentally different from the decision to present that interpretation in a particular way.<sup>40</sup> This can be seen most clearly from cases where the same interpretive decision is presented in multiple ways. For example, both the Damascus Document (CD) and the Temple Scroll condemn the marriage of a niece and her uncle. Doubtless this opinion was reached through reflection on the biblical laws on forbidden marriages, perhaps in light of the situation of the reader's own community—that is, the decision was reached through exegesis.<sup>41</sup> Yet the same interpretation is presented differently in each text. CD uses the form of lemma + comment: after noting that the text's opponents "defile the sanctuary" through, among other things, "each taking the daughter of his brother or the daughter of his sister," the author cites in support of this position Lev 18:13, which forbids intercourse between a man and his aunt (CD 5:6–8). The author then comments upon the verse to show precisely how it supports his claim: "Now the law of forbidden unions is written for [i.e. from the perspective of] males, but like them are the women" (CD 5:9–10). The Temple Scroll, on the other hand, does not present its interpretation in the form of commentary, but simply constructs an analogous law: "A man shall not take the daughter of his brother or the daughter of his sister, for it is

---

argument for a narrower definition) in Benjamin D. Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40–66* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), 23–25.

<sup>40</sup> A rare instance in which this distinction is recognized explicitly is Moshe J. Bernstein and Shlomo A. Koyfman, "The Interpretation of Biblical Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Forms and Methods," in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. Matthias Henze; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 61–87, at pp. 65–66. Bernstein and Koyfman distinguish between the "form" of interpretation—"the way the interpretation is articulated"—and the "method" of interpretation—"the way the interpretation is arrived at." Fishbane seems also to recognize this issue, while nonetheless using 'exegesis' in a broad sense: noting that "inner-biblical exegesis" encompasses a whole variety of ways in which and purposes for which a later text reworks an earlier one, he goes on to ask "How, in the diversity of cases, is exegetical technique related to literary form?"; Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985), 13–14.

<sup>41</sup> See Lawrence H. Schiffman, "Laws Pertaining to Women in the *Temple Scroll*," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 210–28, at p. 227; Bernard M. Levinson, "Textual Criticism, Assyriology, and the History of Interpretation: Deuteronomy 13:7a as a Test Case in Method," *JBL* 120 (2001): 211–43, at p. 232.

an abomination” (TS 66:16–17). The opinion and by all likelihood the interpretive reasoning are the same, but the presentation is totally different. Therefore, instead of referring to both interpretation and presentation as ‘exegesis,’ I would restrict this term to the former process only: the interpretation of a text; the process of coming to a decision about the meaning or appropriate application of the text. ‘Exegetical technique’ would then refer to the means by which such decisions are reached. (Rabbinic hermeneutical principles such as *gezera shava* and *qal wa-homer* in my mind constitute exegetical techniques.)<sup>42</sup> The method by which one chooses to *present* one’s interpretation is what I have chosen to refer to as ‘compositional technique.’

This distinction between compositional technique and exegesis is not simply a terminological quibble. It is necessary for a proper understanding of the texts, because interpretation (exegesis) and rewriting are not the same procedure, and we use different tools to recognize them. Compositional techniques can be identified by comparison of the rewritten text with its scriptural source; that is, by a fairly empirical process.<sup>43</sup> On the other hand, determining the exegetical or theological purpose behind a particular change is a much more subjective procedure, involving judgments about the concerns or goals of the author.<sup>44</sup> Mixing the two categories blends two steps into one: the

<sup>42</sup> Similarly, e.g., Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 14. Along the same lines, Bernstein and Koyfman classify such techniques as “methods of interpretation”; “Interpretation of Biblical Law,” 75–86.

<sup>43</sup> This is not to imply that identification of the scriptural source being reused at any given point, or the description of the nature of that reuse, is free of controversy; see for example the problems discussed by Sommer, *Prophet*, 32–33, and especially Jeffery M. Leonard, “Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions: Psalm 78 as a Test Case,” *JBL* 127 (2008): 241–65.

<sup>44</sup> By shifting the terms slightly to speak of “exegetical or theological purpose,” I am consciously implying an overlap or ambiguity between the exegetical and the theological. On the one hand, I wish to avoid the impression that all changes in a rewritten text stem from what has sometimes been referred to as ‘pure exegesis’—ostensibly a straightforward attempt to respond to a perceived difficulty in the text. Many changes in rewritten texts reflect ideological positions that may or may not have any connection to the particular passage in which the change occurs. On the other hand, even changes that do not seem to spring directly from reflection upon the text at hand often do respond to some feature of the base text—something in the text provides the “exegetical stimulus,” as Kugel puts it, for a change that may do much more than simply interpret or clarify the text at hand. Therefore, ‘ideological’ or ‘theological’ changes in rewritten texts (sometimes referred to as ‘applied exegesis’) cannot really be distinguished from ‘exegetical’ ones. See James L. Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998), 21–22. For a similar point pertaining to the pentateuchal Targumim, see Alexander Samely, *The Interpretation of Speech in the*

identification of the author's concern or problem, and the identification of the means used by the author to address the concern. It risks creating the impression that a particular hermeneutical issue is only addressed compositionally in one particular way. More often, the categorization of a particular change in terms of the exegesis behind it means that the compositional technique by which a change is made is left unaddressed.

A brief example will clarify what I mean. Michael Wise presents a full "compositional analysis" of the Temple Scroll in his 1990 monograph, in which he catalogs the text's relationship to the biblical source according to categories such as "verbatim quotation," "paraphrase," and "free composition."<sup>45</sup> These categories do represent what I would call compositional techniques. However, Wise also includes the categories "midrashic usage" and "halakhic exegesis."<sup>46</sup> Thus he labels TS 43:12b a "halakhic exegesis" of Deut 14:24b. According to this pentateuchal verse, those who live at a great distance from the Temple are permitted to convert their tithes into money and buy equivalent meat and produce upon arrival at the Temple, instead of bringing their own. Wise's assessment is undoubtedly correct from an exegetical perspective: TS interprets Deuteronomy's inexact phrase *כי ירחק ממך המקום*, "if the place is too far from you," by defining the distance beyond which one could convert tithes as a three-days' journey from the Temple. This certainly qualifies as halakhic exegesis. But this label indicates nothing about the actual form in which TS presents its interpretation. The author could have reproduced Deut 14:24b verbatim, for instance, and then simply added a modifier, such as *כי ירחק ממך המקום... דרך... שלושת ימים*, "if the place... is at a distance from you of a three-days' journey..." Instead, the author presents the law by means of the compositional technique of paraphrase, recasting it from the second person to the third person and removing Deuteronomy's oblique reference to the Temple as *המקום*, "the place": *והיושבים במרחק מן המקדש דרך... שלושת ימים*, "But those who live at a distance from the Temple of a three-days' journey..." Wise's language accurately identifies the exegetical

---

*Pentateuch Targums: A Study of Method and Presentation in Targumic Exegesis* (TSAJ 27; Tübingen: Mohr, 1992), 82–85. For the terms 'pure' and 'applied' exegesis, see Geza Vermes, "Bible and Midrash: Early Old Testament Exegesis," in *Post-Biblical Jewish Studies* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 59–91.

<sup>45</sup> Michael Owen Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11* (SAOC 49; Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1990), 205–42.

<sup>46</sup> For the full list of categories, see Wise, *Critical Study*, 208.

procedure behind the change, but does not account for the particular textual form in which TS presents its exegesis.<sup>47</sup> For a full understanding of works that rewrite Scripture, both aspects—the compositional and the exegetical—must be taken into account.

One final comment is necessary. Although I have stressed the need to keep identification of compositional technique separate from identification of exegetical purpose, and noted that compositional technique can be deduced from the text while determining exegetical purpose usually requires a broader understanding of the aims of the author/editor, the two procedures are not entirely independent. Of course determining the motivation for a given deviation from the source text requires analysis of the rewritten text in its specific form. Conversely, and perhaps less obviously, the basic judgment that a given variation between a rewritten text and its scriptural source constitutes a modification by the rewriter, as opposed to a variant reading already present in the *Vorlage*, often depends upon the detection of an exegetical or theological purpose that would explain why someone would want to change the text in the first place. Since we know that the pentateuchal text was still in flux in the late Second Temple period, it is fallacious to assume that every difference between a rewritten text and the Masoretic Text (or any other extant version) is the result of a deliberate change by the author of the rewritten text. More will be said about this below. In this context it is important to note that, especially in the context of smaller additions or alterations, identifying a plausible exegetical motive is often a prerequisite to being able to classify a variant compositionally as an addition, alteration, etc.<sup>48</sup> Thus, even

---

<sup>47</sup> The same difficulty appears in Crawford's analysis of the 4QRP mss (Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 40–46). She labels a number of changes in 4Q364, 4Q365, and 4Q158 “harmonistic changes”—that is, changes that do not involve brand-new, non-pentateuchal material. One could debate Crawford's definition of “harmonistic,” which seems overly broad (on this issue, see further below, section 4.2). Also problematic, however, is the lack of indication that these “harmonistic changes” in fact represent two or three different compositional techniques.

<sup>48</sup> This is not as circular as it may sound. Detection of an exegetical motive behind a particular variant allows for a stronger case to be made that the difference between a rewritten text and its source should be attributed to the author of the later, rewritten text. It does not, however, tell us anything about the compositional technique involved: the decision whether the change constitutes addition or paraphrase or whatever is still based on comparison of the formal elements of the two texts. In other words, one must first determine that a given variant is likely to be a deliberate change on the part of the rewritten text, and then determine which compositional technique was used to make that change.

though compositional technique and exegetical purpose should be investigated separately, they cannot be studied in isolation from one another.

### 1.3.2 *The Categories of Compositional Technique Used in This Study*

One of the difficulties with previous detailed studies of methods of reworking in Second Temple texts is that each has focused on a single text, or a section thereof, and has used its own system of categories and terminology. The profusion of terminological systems naturally complicates any attempt to compare the techniques used in different texts. Out of the examples available, I have therefore tried to develop as flexible a system of categories as possible, one that will allow for precise description of all the texts I will discuss and facilitate easy comparison. I also hope to extend it in the future to texts that I cannot address as a part of this project.

I have chosen to begin from the three most basic categories of changes that can be made to a source text: additions, omissions, and alterations. Models for this type of categorization can be found in Judith Sanderson's analysis of 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup> and in the work of Jacques van Ruiten on Jubilees.<sup>49</sup> Much descriptive work can be accomplished simply by categorizing changes according to one of the three above categories and according to their size (e.g. large additions, minor additions, minor alterations, etc.). However, some further precision is necessary, so I have developed the following subcategories:

#### A. Additions

A.1. Addition of New Material: This category will cover what we most readily think of as 'addition': the insertion of new material not attested elsewhere.

A.2. Addition of Material from Elsewhere: To this category belong additions that derive their content and formulation from another scriptural text (almost exclusively from the Pentateuch in the texts I will examine).<sup>50</sup> The source of the addition is not transposed, deleted,

---

<sup>49</sup> Judith E. Sanderson, *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran: 4QpaleoExodM and the Samaritan Tradition* (HSS 30; Atlanta: Scholars, 1986). For van Ruiten's works, see n. 29 above.

<sup>50</sup> Theoretically this category could also include additions drawing upon sources that did not end up in the Hebrew Bible. We might even speculate that the discovery of a new text that appears to have been a source for one of the texts I examine here

or otherwise disturbed but remains ‘intact’ in its original location (in contrast to rearrangement; see below). In other words, the material is repeated in a new context, creating a duplication of sorts. The Samaritan Pentateuch contains many examples of this technique, for example, the addition of parallel material from Deuteronomy 5 and 18 into the Priestly version of the Decalogue in Exodus 20 (a change also attested in 4Q158).

B. Omissions.

C. Alterations

C.1. Minor Alterations: In this category I include small-scale changes, usually the use of a different form of a word or the replacement of one or two words with other words. An example is the change evident at Gen 2:2 in SP (and G), which reads ויכל אלהים ביום הששי, “God finished on the *sixth* day,” for MT ויכל אלהים ביום השביעי, “God finished on the *seventh* day.”<sup>51</sup>

C.2. Rearrangements: This category refers to instances where a pentateuchal text is actually removed from its context in known versions and put in a new position in the rewritten text; that is, the sequence of the pentateuchal text is changed.

C.3. Paraphrase: In a way, this is rewriting in the most literal sense of the word. Paraphrase reflects the same basic content as the source passage, and may incorporate some of its significant terms, but otherwise is formulated differently. It involves saying the same thing in different words. Technically, paraphrase usually consists of a series of small additions (of new material or material from elsewhere), omissions, alterations, and rearrangements.

C.4. Replacement with Material from Elsewhere: This category involves the insertion of material from elsewhere into a new context, as in the category Addition of Material from Elsewhere. It differs, however, in that some text in the new location is omitted in the course of the insertion. That is, it resembles a minor alteration, where one

---

might result in the ‘reclassification’ of some examples from ‘additions of new material’ to ‘additions of material from elsewhere.’ As will become clear, however, use of this technique in the texts dealt with here often seems to point to a developing ‘canon-consciousness,’ such that various parts of the Torah were being read in light of one another (see especially sections 2.2 and 4.2). Therefore, while theoretically not restricted to the Pentateuch or the Hebrew Bible, in practice this category does not extend beyond those groups of texts.

<sup>51</sup> This example comes from Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2nd ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 92.

word is replaced with another, except on a larger scale, and with the requirement that the replacement derive from another scriptural text.

These categories will be combined with observation of the size and frequency of particular types of changes; thus for example, addition of new material could occur in a given text frequently, rarely, or not at all, and such additions could be large (a line or more), moderate (three words to one line), or minor (one or two words). Charting along these various 'axes' (compositional technique, size, frequency) allows for a fairly nuanced description of the reworking in each particular text, while also allowing for easy comparison.

### 1.3.3 *The Problem of Fragmentary Texts: Addition from Elsewhere vs. Rearrangement*

If the 4QRP mss were perfectly preserved, it would be easy to accurately identify the compositional techniques used in a given passage. Unfortunately, though, all five of the mss are very fragmentary. I have done my best to provide an accurate analysis of the text where it is extant, but at times conclusions about the use of a particular compositional technique must remain tentative.

The fragmentary nature of the mss becomes especially significant in possible cases of addition of material from elsewhere and rearrangement. As noted, addition of material from elsewhere is distinguished from rearrangement insofar as the inserted material is not *removed* from its original context elsewhere in the Pentateuch, but rather *repeated* in a new context while its presence in its original context is retained. In a completely preserved text, like SP, one can simply look to see whether the material is repeated (addition from elsewhere) or has been removed from its original context (rearrangement). In 4Q158 and the other 4QRP mss, however, the original context that would confirm the use of one technique or the other is usually missing. Thus on a purely textual basis there is often no way of knowing whether we are dealing with a repetition of a section of text in a new context or with a rearrangement.

Fortunately, some control is provided by the fact that the two compositional techniques tend to occur in different situations and address different concerns. Because of the repetition it creates, addition of material from elsewhere tends to occur in a range of situations in which such repetition is arguably logical, necessary, or useful, addressing problems of interrelationship, correspondence, and precedent. It

generally functions in situations such as command/promise and fulfillment, or recollection of an earlier event or speech: situations where the text implies the existence of a past or future corresponding event. (Promises suggest eventual fulfillment; recollections suggest an earlier happening that serves as the object of remembrance.) This metanarrative duality is absent in cases of rearrangement. Instead, since rearrangements by definition involve a change in the sequence or organization of a text, they tend to appear in places where such a change in sequence could be seen as desirable or at least makes sense.

In most contexts where either rearrangement or addition from elsewhere is at issue, even fragmentary ones, one of these two options will seem better to fit the situation. If two laws from different parts of the Pentateuch are juxtaposed, for instance, it is hard to imagine that an editor will have *increased* the redundancy of the biblical legal corpora by actually repeating one of the laws in a new context. In this case rearrangement is the more likely alternative, first because it avoids additional redundancy and second because the Torah, by virtue of its composite status, scatters laws on similar topics throughout the legal corpora—a situation that is partially addressed in ‘rewritten’ compositions like the Temple Scroll and Josephus’s *Antiquities*, both of which *rearrange* pentateuchal law to create a more topically organized law code.<sup>52</sup> On the other hand, an insertion that matches the wording of a divine command but is cast in the 3<sup>rd</sup>-person perfect instead of as an imperative (thus making it a fulfillment of that command) is almost certain to be an addition of material from elsewhere, since the insertion would make little sense if the original command was actually removed from its context. Thus, even though we rarely have enough textual data preserved in the 4QRP mss to prove decisively that a given change represents rearrangement rather than addition of material from elsewhere (or the reverse), the evidence usually points strongly in one direction or the other.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> The Temple Scroll’s reorganization of biblical law is well-known; see Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977–83), 1:73. The best treatment to date of Josephus’s legal rewriting remains Robert P. Gallant, “Josephus’ Expositions of Biblical Law: An Internal Analysis” (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1988).

<sup>53</sup> For this issue in 4Q365, with the added complication of possible omission, see section 3.2.6.

### 1.3.4 *Identifying Changes against the Background of a Fluid Text*

I referred earlier to the difficulty of identifying deliberate changes to a pentateuchal text that was still in a state of constant flux. One cannot simply compare a given rewritten text to the MT's *textus receptus* (or, for that matter, to other early versions such as G) and take for granted that the MT (or G) reading constitutes the earliest form in every case. We must constantly keep in mind the possibility that the rewritten texts might preserve readings that are in fact earlier than those preserved in more well-known versions.<sup>54</sup>

Given that caveat, however, it is fair to say that in most cases a decision about the relative lateness of a given change is relatively straightforward. Major variants that are not attested in any other textual witness are unlikely to be particularly early: if they were, it would be surprising that they were not preserved in any other version.<sup>55</sup> If there is evidence that the variants improve the text by filling in gaps or resolving exegetical issues, then their relative lateness is even more probable. Since nearly all of the major variants I will be discussing fulfill one if not both of these criteria, I will generally presume that they represent secondary changes to the shorter base text represented by MT and (usually) G. This procedure is not entirely defensible from a methodological perspective—ideally each variant would be assessed

---

<sup>54</sup> Related to this point, a terminological clarification is necessary regarding my use of the label 'Masoretic Text.' Technically, this term refers to the medieval form of the Hebrew text that includes the work of the Masoretes. However, the fact that many of the copies of biblical books found in the Judean desert match the consonantal text of the MT very, very closely indicates that the medieval MT reflects a text type current in the Second Temple period. For this reason, I will generally use the term MT loosely, to refer to this earlier text type, with the understanding that a slight anachronism is involved. On the early date of the consonantal text of MT, see Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 22–39, especially 27–30.

<sup>55</sup> There is one case that suggests this rule may not be ironclad. One of the manuscripts of Samuel discovered at Qumran, 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, preserves a paragraph that is absent in all other versions. While Rofé has argued that the plus is a later addition, Cross and others present evidence (which I am inclined to accept) that the plus was original and dropped out of most manuscript traditions due to haplography. See Frank Moore Cross, "The Ammonite Oppression of the Tribes of Gad and Reuben: Missing Verses from 1 Samuel 11 found in 4QSamuel<sup>a</sup>," in *History, Historiography and Interpretation* (ed. H. Tadmor and M. Weinfeld; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1983), 148–58; Alexander Rofé, "4QMidrash Samuel?—Observations Concerning the Character of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>," *Textus* 19 (1998): 63–74. In this case, then, a unique reading may in fact be original, against what seems to be the general trend. On the other hand, the paragraph is not totally unique: it is referred to by Josephus, who must have had a form of it in the text of Samuel that he used; Cross, "Ammonite Oppression," 151–52.

on its own terms—but is necessary for practical purposes: it would take many more pages than is conscionable to defend the lateness of every variant individually, especially since the arguments are much the same in each case.

Minor variants are a different story. Additions and changes pertaining to single words are so ubiquitous in the transmission of the pentateuchal text that it is much harder to be certain about the secondary nature of any one particular variant in a rewritten text. In many cases, the change might just as easily have occurred at a later stage in the transmission of the pentateuchal text. Even for minor variants, it is often easy to detect a clarificatory or exegetical purpose that suggests relative lateness. Therefore I do discuss a number of minor variants as illustrative of the compositional techniques present in a given work. However, my assessments concerning these minor changes should be taken as less certain than those pertaining to major variants, since it is much more difficult to be confident that a given variation represents deliberate change.

Another issue pertaining to the fluid nature of the Pentateuch in this period emerges even in cases where the relative lateness of a variant is somewhat clear. That reading still may have originated at an earlier stage in transmission than the rewritten work it now appears in; that is, it may have appeared in the author/editor's *Vorlage*.<sup>56</sup> This in turn raises another tricky question which will recur throughout the following chapters: who is 'the editor' and what constitutes 'the *Vorlage*'? What evidence is there for regarding the 4QRP mss, the various texts related to SP, and TS as products of one primary editorial hand, as opposed to texts that evolved gradually over time through the editorial work of many scribes?

I deal with this question and the types of evidence that might help answer it in section 2.8 below. For now, two points are sufficient. First, I am only concerned in what follows with unique variants. I generally do not discuss readings found in the 4QRP mss or TS that are shared with MT, G, or SP, nor readings in the pre-SP mss or SP that are shared

---

<sup>56</sup> It should be noted that I use the terms 'editor,' 'redactor,' and 'author' more or less interchangeably. In a period in which new texts were often produced via revision of earlier ones and even producing a new manuscript copy of a given work could involve substantial individual creativity on the part of the copyist, it seems best not to make forced distinctions between 'editing' and 'authorship.'

with MT or G.<sup>57</sup> Because they occur in multiple independent witnesses, I presume that these readings most likely did not originate with the texts I am looking at, and therefore do not contribute to an understanding of how Scripture is reworked in those texts. Second, I do not assume that each text I will be looking at is the product of a single editorial hand. As will be discussed below, in all cases, with the partial exception of the Temple Scroll, there is little evidence for and a fair amount of evidence against such a presumption. Rather, I take each text as a (different) witness to the types of rewriting that took place in the Second Temple period. The question of whether this rewriting occurred gradually or all at once is considered separately.

---

<sup>57</sup> In using MT, G, and SP as the standards to which readings are compared, I do not mean to privilege these particular text-types or grant them some kind of normative status in the history of the pentateuchal text. Rather, these texts are the touchstones because they are the only full texts of the Pentateuch that we possess, apart from later translations. While it must be recognized that e.g. MT represents simply one form of the Pentateuch among other forms current in the Second Temple period, in practice we must make use of the texts that we have, and this means using complete versions of the Pentateuch as points of reference for analysis of fragmentary texts like those found at Qumran.