

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Faculty Publications, Classics and Religious
Studies Department

Classics and Religious Studies

January 1999

The "Rewritten" Bible at Qumran: A Look at Three Texts

Sidnie White Crawford

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, scrawford1@unl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/classicsfacpub>



Part of the [Classics Commons](#)

Crawford, Sidnie White, "The "Rewritten" Bible at Qumran: A Look at Three Texts" (1999). *Faculty Publications, Classics and Religious Studies Department*. 35.
<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/classicsfacpub/35>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Classics and Religious Studies at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications, Classics and Religious Studies Department by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

THE “REWRITTEN” BIBLE AT QUMRAN: A LOOK AT THREE TEXTS*

SIDNIE WHITE CRAWFORD

University of Nebraska–Lincoln

Since the discovery of the Qumran scrolls in the late 1940s and 1950s, certain manuscripts of the collection¹ have been described by the term “Rewritten Bible.” This grouping has been rather loosely defined, but the criteria for membership in this category include a close attachment, either through narrative or themes, to some book contained in the present Jewish canon of Scripture, and some type of reworking, whether through rearrangement, conflation, or supplementation, of the present canonical biblical text.² Thus, works such as Pseudo-Ezekiel or Pseudo-Daniel would be excluded from the category, since, although thematically related to a biblical text (Ezekiel, Daniel), they do not reuse the actual biblical text. However, the three texts under consideration here, 4QRe-worked Pentateuch, the Temple Scroll and Jubilees, do fit this rather loose definition. All three are closely attached to the text of the Pentateuch, or Torah, and all three contain a more or less extensive reworking of the present canonical text of the Pentateuch. Thus it would seem that the designation “Rewritten Bible” is a suitable one for these texts.

Before continuing, however, it would be worthwhile to consider whether this category of “Rewritten Bi-

ble” is correct when describing part of the Qumran corpus. Both elements in the designation can be called into question. First, the term “Bible” is anachronistic at Qumran. A bible, in the sense of a fixed collection of sacred books regarded as authoritative by a particular religious tradition, did not exist during the time in which the Qumran corpus was copied (roughly 250 BCE to 68 CE).³ For instance, the number of books regarded as authoritative was not fixed. Strong, if not definitive, cases can be made for the books of the Torah, at least some of the Prophets, and the Psalms, but the case for books such as Chronicles is ambiguous at best. In the other direction, strong cases can be made for books not now considered canonical, such as Enoch and Jubilees (see below). Second, as the work of Cross, Talmon, Ulrich, Tov and others has shown,⁴ the text of the books we now term “biblical” was not fixed in this period, but pluriform. The term “rewritten,” then, can be called into question as well, for if a fixed text does not exist, can it be rewritten? In light of these considerations, the category itself appears slippery, since at Qumran there is no easy dividing line between biblical and non-biblical, authoritative and non-authoritative texts. Therefore, the best procedure would be to consider each text separately as part of a range of texts found at Qumran representing in some way the text of the Pentateuch, and to try to determine each text’s function and status within that range. First, I will give a brief survey of the manuscripts of Genesis through Deuteronomy commonly classified as “biblical.”

The book of Genesis appears in sixteen manuscripts (Caves 1, 2, 4, and 6), Exodus in fourteen manuscripts,

* It gives me great pleasure to dedicate this article to my dear teacher, mentor and friend, Frank Moore Cross, “from whom I gratefully acknowledge myself to have learnt best and most.” This article builds on his expertise as a pioneer in Qumran studies, especially the biblical manuscripts. My work has been greatly improved by conversation with several colleagues, in particular the comments of G. Nickelsburg and M. Himmelfarb at the Pseudepigrapha Section of the Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting, San Francisco, November, 1997.

including one Greek manuscript (Caves 1, 2, 4, and 7), Leviticus in eight manuscripts (Caves 1, 2, 4, 6, and 11), Numbers, in five manuscripts (Caves 2 and 4), and Deuteronomy in twenty-eight manuscripts (Caves 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and 11). In addition, the following manuscripts contained at least two books of the Torah copied on one scroll: 4QGen-Exod^a, 4QpaleoGen-Exod^l, 4QExod-Lev^f, and 4QLev-Num^a. For each of the biblical books, the manuscript remains reflect a variety of witnesses to the biblical texts; in other words, the texts were pluriform.

Most of the variants are minor and attest to scribal error rather than conscious revision;⁵ exceptions to this statement are the proto-Samaritan manuscripts 4QpaleoExod^m and 4QNum^b et al., which represent, as Cross has stated, a “conscious and extensive expansion and revision of the text.”⁶ The proto-Samaritan manuscripts are characterized as “harmonizing” texts, that is, texts which seek to bring disparate elements of the text into harmony with each other.⁷ The proto-Samaritan text can safely be called a variant edition, the product of intentional scribal intervention in the text. For example, at Exod 20:19–22, part of the Sinai theophany, the proto-Samaritan text harmonizes by importing material from Deut 5:29 and 18:18–22 concerning a future “prophet like Moses”. This is, in fact, a form of exegesis in which the exegetical elements are built into the flow of the biblical narrative.⁸ The result, according to the proto-Samaritan text, is that God promises Moses a prophetic successor already during the Sinai theophany. When this kind of scribal intervention was extensive enough, the result was a variant edition of a text.

This type of scribal activity probably began in the pre-exilic period, since we can discern in many biblical books the use of sources woven into a literary whole by a later redactor/scribe (e.g., the Pentateuch itself). This role of the scribe as an active participant in the text, as well as a faithful copier of it, continued into the Second Temple period with, for example, the production of the Book of Esther, which exists in three literary editions, the latest, LXX Esther, being a conscious revision and expansion of MT Esther. The same type of scribal activity also produced the proto-Samaritan text.⁹

Ulrich has argued that the same kind of exegetical scribal activity produced 4QReworked Pentateuch, a “Rewritten Bible” text recently published by E. Tov and S. White.¹⁰ According to Ulrich, 4QRP should not be viewed as a “new” composition, but simply as an expanded biblical text.¹¹ We will examine that contention and the corollary question that rises from it: how was such a text viewed by the community that preserved it?

4QReworked Pentateuch

4QReworked Pentateuch appears in five manuscripts found in Cave 4, Qumran: 4Q158, 4Q364, 4Q365, 4Q366 and 4Q367.¹² The manuscripts preserve portions of the Torah from Genesis through Deuteronomy. As Tov has stated in the *editio princeps*, the base text, where it can be determined for 4Q364 and probably 4Q365, was the proto-Samaritan text;¹³ but 4QRP is characterized by further reworkings of the text, most notably, the regrouping of passages according to a common theme and the addition of previously unknown material into the text. Two examples will suffice. In 4Q366, frag. 4, col. 1, the following pericopes concerning the Sukkot festival are grouped together: Num 29:32–30:1 and Deut 16:13–14 (since the text is fragmentary, it is possible that a third text, Lev 23:34–43, was placed here as well; it appears in 4Q365, followed by a large addition). An example of an addition occurs in 4Q365, frag. 6, following Exod 15:21, where a six-line “Song of Miriam” has been inserted to fill a perceived gap in the text.¹⁴ In neither case, nor in any of the other reworkings of the biblical text, is there any scribal indication that this is changed or new material.¹⁵ As Fishbane has noted for the phenomenon generally, there is no clear separation between lemmas and commentary in texts containing inner-biblical exegesis.¹⁶ Therefore, it seems clear that the reader of this text was expected to view it as a text of the Pentateuch, not a “changed Pentateuch” or a “Pentateuch plus additions.” In other words, if one were to place 4QReworked Pentateuch on a continuum of Pentateuchal texts, the low end of the continuum would contain the shorter, unexpanded texts such as 4QDeut^g; next would be a text such as 4QExod^a (representing the Old

Greek); then the expanded texts in the proto-Samaritan tradition such as 4QpaleoExod^m and 4QNum^b; and finally, the most expanded text of all, 4QReworked Pentateuch. Thus far, Ulrich's contention that 4QRP is a variant edition of the Pentateuch is sound.

However, the question of 4QRP's function and status in the community which preserved it remains unanswered. Although the question of canonicity is inappropriate in this time-period, the question of authority is not, since the Qumran community clearly accorded divine authority to certain texts, including the Pentateuch. If, then, Ulrich is correct when he argues that "it was the sacred work or book that was important, not the specific edition or specific wording of the work,"¹⁷ then we can assume that 4QRP, as a text of the Pentateuch, was accorded divine authority by the Qumran community and leave it at that.

However, I believe a more nuanced position regarding 4QRP is called for. I agree with Ulrich and Talmon that a "limited flux"¹⁸ in the textual tradition of authoritative books was both expected and accepted, with the stress on the key word "limited." As Talmon also states in the same article, "The scope of variation within all these textual traditions is relatively restricted."¹⁹ I would argue that the scribal intervention in the text of 4QRP is drastic enough to call its divine authority in the community that preserved it into question. The major difference between 4QRP and other expanded texts of the Pentateuch is that 4QRP adds *new* material, not simply material taken from elsewhere in the biblical text. This difference changes the nature of 4QRP. As Sanderson has noted for 4QpaleoExod^m (and by implication for the proto-Samaritan text group as a whole), "none of the major expansions which have been discovered involved freedom to compose text. No new text was added."²⁰ Thus, since 4QRP moves beyond the confines of scribal practice noted for the proto-Samaritan text group, it cannot simply be lumped together with other expanded texts and its authoritative status cannot be assumed. Therefore, stricter controls on the question of authority are called for.

VanderKam has established a set of criteria by which to determine whether the Qumran community considered a book authoritative.²¹ Although VanderKam himself does not differentiate among his criteria, they

can be divided into two categories. The first is compositional intention. VanderKam asks the question. *How does the book present itself?* In other words, does the author (redactor, compiler) wish the book to be understood as a divinely inspired composition? If so, then the work presents itself as authoritative. The other two criteria, *Is a book quoted as an authority?* and *Is the book the subject of a commentary?*, have to do with community acceptance. That is, by quoting or commenting on a work, a community signals its acceptance of that work as divinely inspired. Both of these functions, compositional intention and community acceptance, should be present for a work to be considered authoritative.²² By applying these criteria to 4QRP, we may perhaps gain a better perspective on its standing as an authoritative book in the collection in which it was found.

The first criterion to be investigated is *How does the book present itself?*, that is, is the reader of the scroll meant to view it as authoritative? In the case of 4QRP, since the text simply presents itself, according to the evidence we have available, as a Torah text, it does present itself as authoritative. So 4QRP meets the first criterion for authority, compositional intention.

Is a book quoted as an authority? is the second criterion. Obviously, in the Qumran collection, the Five Books of Moses were quoted as authorities countless times; however, there is not one clear instance where a "reworked" portion of 4QRP is cited as an authority. That is, we have no quotation from the unique portions of 4QRP preceded or followed by a formula such as "as it is written" or "as Moses said". There are, however, two possible instances where 4QRP is alluded to or used as a source by another work, which may imply some kind of authoritative status.

The first instance occurs in 4Q364, frag. 3, col. 1, in the story of Jacob and Esau. 4QRP is here expanded, probably (although the text is not extant) after Gen 28:5: "And Isaac sent Jacob, and he went to Paddan Aram to Laban, the son of Bethuel the Aramean, brother of Rebekah the mother of Jacob and Esau." The expansion, for which we do not possess the beginning, concerns Rebekah's grief over the departing Jacob and Isaac's consolation of her. The text then continues with Gen 28:6. The expansion found

here in 4QRP echoes a similar expansion in Jubilees 27, where Rebekah grieves after her departing son and Isaac consoles her. In 4Q364 the phrases in question are “him you shall see” (וְתוֹא הָאֵרַת, l. 1), “you shall see in peace” (הָאֵרַת מוֹלֶשֶׁב, l. 2), and “after Jacob her son” (הַנֵּב בּוֹקֵעֵי יִרְחָא, l. 6), which recall Jub 27:14 and 17: “the spirit of Rebecca grieved after her son,” and “we see him in peace” (unfortunately, these verses are not found in the Hebrew fragments of Jubilees found at Qumran²³). Both texts also contain a reminiscence of Gen 27:45, “why should I be deprived of both of you in one day?”. The passages are similar but not parallel. Is one alluding to or quoting the other? It seems possible, especially since this particular expansion does not occur in other reworked biblical texts of Genesis (e.g., Pseudo-Philo).²⁴ If that is the case, it would seem more likely that Jubilees is alluding to 4QRP than the other way around, since Jubilees is a much more systematic and elaborate reworking of the Pentateuch than 4QRP, which has here simply expanded two biblical verses. If indeed Jubilees has used 4QRP as a source, this would indicate that at least to the author of Jubilees the text had some status.²⁵

The second instance is from 4Q365, frag. 23, where, following Lev 24:2, the text has a long addition concerning festival offerings, including the festival of fresh oil and the wood festival, which are also found in the Temple Scroll. In fact, as was first noted in print by Yadin, material in frag. 23 is parallel to cols. 23–24 of the Temple Scroll.²⁶ Since I have given detailed arguments elsewhere as to the similarities and differences between the parallel material in 4QRP and the Temple Scroll, I will not repeat them here.²⁷ The decisive parallel, which points to a definite relationship, is the order of the tribes bringing the wood for the Wood Festival; this order occurs only here in 4QRP and in the Temple Scroll, and nowhere else. The question is whether one text is citing or alluding to the other. J. Strugnell, the original editor of 4QRP, suggested the possibility,²⁸ and H. Stegemann has argued outright, that 4QRP is a source for the Temple Scroll.²⁹ M. Wise believed that frag. 23, for which he did not have the context of the rest of 4Q365, was part of his “D Source” for the Temple Scroll.³⁰ Wise, in fact, argues that the additional material in frag. 23 is “Deu-

teronomizing,” an attempt to update Leviticus by the inclusion of Deuteronomistic language and concerns.³¹ This is not, however, simply the importation of passages from Deuteronomy into the text of Leviticus, but the addition of new material which, though it might sound like Deuteronomy, is not actually found there. It is the unique material in 4QRP that is paralleled in the Temple Scroll. Once again, it seems most reasonable to argue from the simpler to the more complex: The Temple Scroll, a more thorough reworking of the Torah with a clear ideological bias, has borrowed material from the expansionistic 4QRP.³² Thus, we have two possible examples of the use of 4QRP as a source. However, since neither Jubilees nor the Temple Scroll indicates it is borrowing material, or cites a text that might be 4QRP, we are still in the realm of likelihood. We have no unquestionable instances of 4QRP being cited as an authoritative text.

To return to the criteria for authority, the third criterion, *Is the book the subject of a commentary?*, such as Habakkuk in Peshar Habakkuk, remains to be addressed. The conclusion in this case is simple: 4QRP is not the subject of a commentary.

4QRP, then, by failing to meet the second and third criteria beyond a reasonable doubt, does not meet the second overall requisite for authoritative status, community acceptance. This is not to say that 4QRP never, by anyone or at any time, was considered to have some type of status. The fact that it is found in five similar copies would indicate some degree of interest, and its existence, along with all the other, smaller examples of “rewritten” Pentateuch texts,³³ testifies to the importance of and fascination with the books of the Pentateuch in Second Temple Judaism, as exemplified by the Qumran community. What is lacking, however, for 4QRP is the desirable instance of an absolutely certain citation — whence our caution concerning its authoritative status.

Why did 4QRP not receive, as far as we are able to ascertain from the evidence available to us, community acceptance as an authoritative text? I would suggest that it was because 4QRP was perceived not as a biblical text, but as a commentary, an inner-biblical commentary on the text of the Torah. 4QRP took a relatively stabilized base text, in this case proba-

bly the already expansionist proto-Samaritan text, and inserted its comments and interpretations, particularly its new material, with no clear separation between text and comment. This type of scribal activity, intervention in the text of the Pentateuch for the purpose of exegesis, had, as already stated, a long history, extending back at least to the period of the Exile.³⁴ Some of these scribally manipulated texts were, of course, later accepted as authoritative. The proto-Samaritan text itself is a good example of this process; it was selected, with two ideological changes, as the chosen authoritative Scripture of the Samaritan community.³⁵ Such was not the fate of 4QRP, which ceased to be copied after the Hasmonean period and was lost in the tradition. This may be due to the fact that 4QRP is a relatively late exemplar of this type of inner-biblical commentary, coming at a time (probably the second century BCE³⁶) when the counter-impulse to comment on a text by clearly differentiating between lemma and comment was already under way.³⁷ 4QRP was thus recognized as an expansion of the already relatively stable text of the Torah and relegated to the ranks of commentary. This scenario is, of course, speculative.³⁸ However, 4QReworked Pentateuch is certainly illustrative of the practice by scribes of the art of inner-biblical commentary in the late Second Temple period; it is thus an important link in the chain of scribes from the pre-exilic period through the Masoretes and beyond.

Jubilees and the Temple Scroll

This paper would be incomplete without a brief comment on the nature and authoritative status of the two other large Hebrew “Rewritten Bible” texts found at Qumran, *Jubilees* and the *Temple Scroll*.

Jubilees, which was found in fourteen or fifteen copies in five caves at Qumran,³⁹ is an extensive reworking of Genesis 1–Exodus 12 that presupposes and advocates, among other things, the use of the 364-day solar calendar. The author of *Jubilees* wishes to show that the solar calendar and the religious festivals and halakhah (and his particular interpretation of them) were not only given to Moses on Sinai, but were presupposed in the creation of the universe and carried out in the antediluvian and patriarchal history.⁴⁰ There

is little doubt that *Jubilees* was an authoritative text for the group at Qumran that preserved it. It is cited by name in the Damascus Document (CD) 16:3–4 and probably alluded to in CD 10:8–10. Therefore, it meets the criterion of citation (it is not, however, the subject of a commentary). It also presents itself as authoritative; the fragments from Qumran make it clear that *Jubilees* claims to have been dictated to Moses by an angel of the Presence.⁴¹ Since the book both wishes to be seen as divinely inspired and is granted community acceptance as an authority, it is probable that *Jubilees* had some kind of authoritative status at Qumran.

The *Temple Scroll*, found in two copies from Cave 11 and two different recensions from Cave 4,⁴² is a reworking of parts of the biblical text from Exodus through Deuteronomy with a clear ideology. It embraces the solar calendar and advocates a particular interpretation of the halakhah — especially with regard to purity, festivals, and the law of the king — combined with its vision of the ideal temple. The *Temple Scroll* has been the subject of much controversy regarding its status and function at Qumran. Yadin stated unequivocally that the *Temple Scroll* “was conceived and accepted by the Essene community as a sacred canonical [sic] work.”⁴³ Others have sharply disagreed with this assessment. Stegemann, for example, states that “there is not one mention of the *Temple Scroll*’s existence in any of the other Qumranic writings . . . there is not one quotation from the *Temple Scroll*.”⁴⁴ Therefore, Stegemann argues, it is not “Scripture” (a designation which we would argue is itself anachronistic). According to VanderKam’s criteria, the *Temple Scroll* meets the criterion of compositional intention, that is, it presents itself as Scripture (it is pseudopigraphical in the most audacious way: God is speaking in the first person to Moses!). However, it does not meet the criteria of community acceptance: it is not cited as authoritative elsewhere in the Qumran literature (as far as I am aware) and it is not the subject of a commentary. Unless further evidence surfaces, we may presume, therefore, that the *Temple Scroll* was probably not authoritative in the Qumran community. Why this was the case is not clear; that most of the ideas expressed in the *Temple Scroll* were congenial to the Qumran community is certain, in particular the use of the solar calendar.⁴⁵

4QReworked Pentateuch, the Temple Scroll, and Jubilees form a constellation of texts preserved by the Qumran community. All three are closely related to the Torah, 4QRP as the product of scribal intervention for the purpose of exegesis, the Temple Scroll and Jubilees as more thorough reworkings with theological agendas. They bear more in common as well: 4QRP and the Temple Scroll both mention the Fresh Oil festival and the Wood festival in their legal sections, while the 364-day solar calendar advocated by Jubilees is presupposed by the Temple Scroll.⁴⁶ Finally, as stated above, it is possible that both the Tem-

ple Scroll and Jubilees draw on 4QRP as a source. As VanderKam has stated concerning Jubilees and the Temple Scroll, “the authors of the two are drawing upon the same exegetical, cultic tradition.”⁴⁷ That manuscript group should also include 4QRP, possibly as a source, but certainly as part of that exegetical tradition. This common tradition, evidenced by three major texts from Qumran, is further evidence that the manuscripts from Qumran are not eclectic, but a collection, reflecting the theological tendency of a particular group, some of whom at least resided at Qumran during the Second Temple period.

NOTES

¹ Despite recent attempts to argue that there is no connection between the scrolls found in the eleven caves in the vicinity of Qumran and the ruins of Khirbet Qumran, I remain convinced that the scrolls were a collection, probably a library, stored in the caves by the inhabitants of Qumran sometime before its destruction in 68 CE. This is not to say that all, or even the majority, of the manuscripts were composed or copied at Qumran; they were simply collected there. Cf. L. H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Philadelphia and Jerusalem, 1994, pp. 37–61, and J. C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, Grand Rapids, MI, 1994, pp. 3–28. For a specific critique of the various archaeological theories regarding the ruins of Qumran, cf. J. Magness, “A Villa at Khirbet Qumran?,” *RQ* 16 (1994), pp. 397–420.

² Cf. G. Vermes, “Bible Interpretation at Qumran,” *Eretz-Israel* 20 (1989), pp. 185–188.

³ For a discussion of the formation of the canon, see, e.g., J. A. Sanders, “Canon, Hebrew Bible” in D. N. Freedman *et al.* (eds.), *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, Vol. 1, New York, 1992, pp. 837–852, and the literature cited there.

⁴ See the articles by F. M. Cross and S. Talmon in F. M. Cross and S. Talmon (eds.), *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*, Cambridge, 1975. For E. Ulrich’s views, see, for example, “Multiple Literary Editions: Reflections Toward a Theory of the History of the Biblical Text,” in D. W. Parry and S. D. Ricks (eds.), *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conference on the Texts from the Judean Desert, Jerusalem, 30 April 1995*, Leiden, 1996, pp. 78–195. For the views of E. Tov, consult his *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, Assam and Minneapolis, 1992.

⁵ The reader is directed to the editions of the manuscripts in R. de Vaux *et al.* (eds.), *DJD* I, III, IX, XII, XIV, and XV, Oxford, 1955 etc.

⁶ F. M. Cross, “Some Notes on a Generation of Qumran Studies,” in J. Treballe Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner (eds.), *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18–21 March 1991*, Vol. 1, Leiden, 1992, p. 10.

⁷ E. Tov, “The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts,” *JSOT* 31 (1985), pp. 3–29.

⁸ As noted by M. J. Bernstein in “4Q252: From Rewritten Bible to Biblical Commentary,” *JJS* 45 (1994), p. 12.

⁹ For a discussion of the scribe as custodian and tradent of the written *traditum*, see M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, Oxford, 1985. See also J. Sander-son’s excellent discussion of scribal and editorial activity in *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran: 4QpaleoExod^m and the Samaritan Tradition* (HSS 30), Atlanta, GA, 1986, pp. 35–37, 261–306.

¹⁰ E. Tov and S. White, “Reworked Pentateuch” in J. VanderKam *et al.* (eds.), *DJD* XIII, Oxford, 1994, pp. 187–352, plates XIII–XXXVI.

¹¹ E. Ulrich, “The Qumran Scrolls and the Biblical Text,” in L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J. VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls — Fifty Years After Their Discovery—Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 10–25, 1997*, Jerusalem, forthcoming.

¹² J. M. Allegro, “Qumran Cave 4:1 (4Q158–4Q186)” in *DJD* V, Oxford, 1968, pp. 1–6; plate 1. Tov and White, *op. cit.* (n. 10). M. Segal has recently argued that 4Q158 should not be classified as a manuscript of 4QRP, but is a separate composition. See his paper, “4QReworked Pentateuch or 4QPentateuch?,” in L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J. VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls—Fifty Years After Their Discovery—Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 10–25, 1997*, Jerusalem, forthcoming. However, if I am

correct in arguing that 4QRP is the result of scribal intervention in a previously established text rather than a composition by an author, then the division into separate compositions is less meaningful. Each manuscript is simply the product of more or less scribal intervention. Also, the overlap among the five manuscripts must be taken into consideration; for a listing, see Tov, "Introduction," *DJD* XIII, pp. 190–191, and "4QReworked Pentateuch: A Synopsis of its Contents," *RQ* 16 (1995), p. 653.

¹³ Tov, *ibid.*, pp. 192–196.

¹⁴ Tov and White, *op. cit.* (n. 10), pp. 269–272.

¹⁵ Of course, all five manuscripts are fragmentary, so this claim is not absolutely certain.

¹⁶ Fishbane, *op. cit.* (n. 9), p. 12.

¹⁷ E. Ulrich, "Pluriformity in the Biblical Text, Text Groups, and Questions of Canon," in J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner (eds.), *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18–21 March 1991*, Vol. 1, Leiden, 1992, p. 36.

¹⁸ S. Talmon, "The Textual Study of the Bible — A New Outlook" in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*, Cambridge, 1975, p. 326.

¹⁹ Talmon, *ibid.*, p. 326.

²⁰ Sanderson, *op. cit.* (n. 9), p. 299.

²¹ VanderKam, *op. cit.* (n. 1), p. 150.

²² Because of accidents of preservation among the Qumran corpus, not all books that may have had some authoritative status will meet these criteria. Therefore, there is a certain degree of "argument from silence" in claiming that works that do not meet these criteria were therefore not authoritative. However, it is likewise an argument from silence to claim authority for these same works. A level of uncertainty is always present on either side.

²³ J. VanderKam and J. T. Milik, "Jubilees," in J. VanderKam et al. (eds.), *DJD* XIII, Oxford, 1994, pp. 1–186, plates I–XII.

²⁴ However, G. Nickelsburg has called my attention to the fact that Tobit 5:17–20, where Tobit and his wife bid farewell to the departing Tobias, bears a striking similarity to this scene in 4QRP and Jubilees. The key phrases are "and his mother wept," and "your eyes will see him on the day when he returns to you in peace (בִּשְׂמֵחָא)." Unfortunately, most of this passage is not extant in 4QTobit^a, so a direct comparison is not possible (cf. J. Fitzmyer, "Tobit," in J. VanderKam et al. (eds.), *DJD* XIX, Oxford, 1995, pp. 1–76, plates I–X). It is probable that the author of Tobit had this Genesis passage in mind, although there is no direct evidence that he knew 4QRP's version of it, and it is improbable, based on Tobit's date of composition (250–175. BCE), that he knew Jubilees "version (cf.

C. Moore, *Tobit* (AB 40A), New York, 1996, pp. 40–42). I would like to thank Prof. Nickelsburg for calling this reference to my attention.

²⁵ Of course, it is also possible that the two texts are drawing on a common fund of tradition. If the author of Tobit was unaware of 4QRP or Jubilees, yet incorporated similar material into his leave-taking scene, then the argument for a common fund of material is strengthened.

²⁶ Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, Vol. 2, rev. English ed., Jerusalem, 1983, p. 103.

²⁷ See my article "Three Fragments from Qumran Cave 4 and their Relationship to the Temple Scroll," *JQR* 85 (1994), pp. 259–273.

²⁸ As quoted by B. Z. Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran*, Cincinnati, 1983, pp. 205–206.

²⁹ H. Stegemann, "The Literary Composition of the Temple Scroll and its Status at Qumran," in G. Brooke (ed.), *Temple Scroll Studies*, Sheffield, 1989, p. 135.

³⁰ M. Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11* (SAOC 49), Chicago, 1990, pp. 58–59.

³¹ Wise, *ibid.*, pp. 48–50.

³² Of course, one could argue, as also in the Jubilees example, that both were drawing on a common source. That source, however, is hypothetical. See Wise, *ibid.*, ch. 2.

³³ See the partial list in Tov, "4QReworked Pentateuch," *RQ* 16 (1994), pp. 649–650. No doubt, as these smaller texts become better known, the list will grow longer.

³⁴ Fishbane, *op. cit.* (n. 9), p. 36, suggests that scribal interest in the legal texts of Israel began during the reform of Josiah.

³⁵ The ideological changes are the substitution of Mt. Gerizim for Jerusalem as the central place of worship, and the change of the verb tense from future, in the Deuteronomic formulation "the place which the Lord will choose," to past, "the place which the Lord has chosen," to indicate that God had already chosen Mt. Gerizim in the patriarchal period. Cf. Tov, *op. cit.* (n. 4), pp. 94–95.

³⁶ There is no sure indication of the date of 4QRP. Its manuscripts are all Hasmonean in date (Tov and White, *op. cit.* (n. 10), p. 201 etc.), which would locate it at least in the late second century BCE. There is no obvious reason, however, why it could not be earlier. If it was used as a source by Jubilees and the Temple Scroll, it would have to be prior to them.

³⁷ An interesting text that seems to combine these two types of exegesis is 4Q252, A Commentary on Genesis^a. See G. Brooke, "Commentaries on Genesis and Malachi," in G. Brooke et al. (eds.), *DJD* XXII, Oxford, 1996, pp. 185–208, plates XII–XIII.

³⁸ It should also be noted that we cannot assume a stable

notion of authority throughout the history of the community. Certain texts may have fallen out of favor while others became more prominent. The fact that 4QRP only exists in Hasmonean manuscripts may be important; it is possible that at an earlier stage in the community's history, or indeed within Second Temple Judaism generally, 4QRP was accorded, as suggested above, some kind of status, perhaps even authoritative status, but later fell out of favor and ceased to be copied. This scenario would shed some light on its (possible) use as a source by Jubilees and the Temple Scroll.

³⁹ J. VanderKam, "The Jubilee Fragments from Qumran Cave 4," in J. Treballe Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner (eds.), *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18–21 March 1991*, Vol. 2, Leiden, 1992, p. 648.

⁴⁰ For a convenient English translation of Jubilees, see O. S. Wintermute, "Jubilees" in J. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, Vol. 2, New York, 1985, pp. 35–142.

⁴¹ VanderKam, *op. cit.* (n. 39), pp. 646–647.

⁴² 11QTemple^a: Y. Yadin, *op. cit.* (n. 26). 11QTemple^b: F. Garcia Martinez, "11QTemple^b. A Preliminary Publication," in J. Treballe Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner (eds.), *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18–21 March 1991*, Vol. 2, Leiden, 1992, pp. 363–392. 4QTem-

ple?: S. White, "4QTemple?," in J. VanderKam *et al.* (eds.), *DJD XIII*, Oxford, 1994. 4Q542: E. Puech, "Fragments du plus ancien exemplaire du *Rouleau du Temple* (4Q542)," in M. Bernstein, F. Garcia Martinez, J. Kampen (eds.), *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995*, Leiden, 1997, pp. 19–66.

⁴³ Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll: The Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect*, New York, 1985, p. 68.

⁴⁴ H. Stegemann, "The Literary Composition of the Temple Scroll and its Status at Qumran," in G. Brooke (ed.), *Temple Scroll Studies*, Sheffield, 1989, pp. 127–128.

⁴⁵ However, there are differences between some of the legal positions advocated in the Temple Scroll and other Qumran documents, e.g., the laws concerning oaths and vows. Cf. L. Schiffman, "The Temple Scroll and the Nature of its Law," in E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam (eds.), *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Notre Dame, IN, 1994, pp. 37–56, and "The Law of Vows and Oaths (Num. 30, 3–16) in the Zadokite Documents and the Temple Scroll," *RQ* 15 (1991), pp. 199–213.

⁴⁶ J. VanderKam, "The Temple Scroll and the Book of Jubilees," in G. Brooke (ed.), *Temple Scroll Studies*, Sheffield, 1989, p. 216.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 232.

Published in *Eretz-Israel: Archaeological, Historical and Geographical Studies*, Volume 26 (Frank Moore Cross Volume), edited by Baruch A. Levine, Philip J. King, Joseph Naveh, and Ephraim Stern. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1999. Pages 1–8. Copyright © 1999 Israel Exploration Society. Used by permission.