

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Faculty Publications, Classics and Religious
Studies Department

Classics and Religious Studies

1998

The Rewritten Bible at Qumran

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" (1998). *Faculty Publications, Classics and Religious Studies Department*. 91.
<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/classicsfacpub/91>

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

Sidnie White Crawford

Since the discovery of the scrolls from the Qumran caves in the late 1940s and early-to-mid 50s, the process of sorting, identifying, and editing the fragmentary manuscripts has occupied the attention of scholars. Now, as that period in the history of scrolls scholarship draws to a close, more and more attention has turned to the contents of the texts from the eleven caves in the vicinity of Khirbet Qumran as a collection. Several things may be said about this collection. First, the majority of the texts are written in Hebrew, thus pointing to Hebrew as a living language (at least in literature) in the Second Temple Period. Second, a large percentage of the texts found in the caves (about 25 percent) are copies of books later considered part of the canon of the Hebrew Bible; there are also copies of books that were later grouped into the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.¹ Third, of the “previously unknown” works unearthed from the caves, the vast majority of them bear some relationship to the books that later became known as the Hebrew Bible. It is with classifying and understanding these manuscripts, both individually and in relation to one another, that scholarship is now occupied.

One of the groups of manuscripts that has been identified from the Qumran caves is the “Rewritten Bible” texts. A “Rewritten Bible” text may be defined as a text that has a close narrative attachment to some book contained in the present Jewish canon of scripture, and some type of reworking,

1 It is a well-known and well-rehearsed fact that every book of the Hebrew Bible except for Esther and Nehemiah was found at Qumran, but that statement ignores the equally important fact that Tobit, *Enoch*, *Jubilees*, Ecclesiasticus, the Letter of Jeremiah, and Psalm 151 were found there as well.

whether through rearrangement, conflation, omission, or supplementation of the present canonical biblical text.² This category is to be differentiated from the “parabiblical” texts, which may be tied to some person, event, or pericope in the present canonical text, but do not actually reuse extensively the biblical text.³ Many of these works can be categorized into specific genres, such as Testament (e.g., *Testament of Naphtali*), while others are pseudepigraphs (e.g., *Pseudo-Ezekiel*, *Pseudo-Daniel*). A third category may be described as works loosely related to a biblical book, but with no overt tie, such as the *Prayer of Nabonidus* or *Proto-Esther* (a.k.a. *Tales of the Persian Court*). None of these categories include the commentaries (e.g., *Pesher Nahum*, *Pesher Habakkuk*), which make a clear distinction between biblical lemma and interpretation, although this genre was growing in importance during the Second Temple Period and is well attested at Qumran. For the purposes of this paper, the last two categories need not detain us. Rather, the subject under investigation will be the definition of the category “Rewritten Bible” and the classification of certain texts in it.

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

2 Cf. G. Vermes, “Bible Interpretation at Qumran,” *Eretz Israel* 20 (1989) pp. 185–88.

3 The list of works included in the category is long. Those based on passages from the Pentateuch include the *Exhortation Based on the Flood*, *A Paraphrase of Genesis and Exodus*, an *Apocryphon of Joseph*, *Apocryphon of Jacob*, *Testament of Judah*, *Apocryphon of Judah*, *Aramaic Levi Document*, *Testament of Levi*, *Testament of Naphtali*, *Testament of Qahat*, *Visions of Amram*, *Hur and Miriam*, *Apocryphon of Moses*, *Pseudo-Moses*, and *Words of Moses*. Those based on books of the Prophets include *Pseudo-Joshua*, *Vision of Samuel*, and *Pseudo-Ezekiel*. Those based on books of the Writings include *Pseudo-Daniel*.

CE).⁴ First, the number of books regarded as authoritative was not fixed in this period. However, it is clear from the scanty evidence available that certain books were generally accepted as divinely inspired and hence authoritative. This evidence includes the prologue to the Wisdom of Jesus ben Sirach (Ecclesiasticus; c. 135 BCE), which enumerates the books to which one should devote one's study as "the Law and the Prophets and other books." From Qumran itself, 4QMMT col. 10 (dated by its editors to the middle of the second century BCE) lists "the book of Moses and the books of the Prophets and (the writings of) David." 4 Ezra 14:23–48 (written shortly after 70 CE) states that God ordered Ezra "to make public the twenty-four books that you wrote first"; the number of twenty-four corresponds to one enumeration of the present Jewish canon, indicating that for the author of 4 Ezra the canon was similar if not identical to the present canon. Josephus, in *Against Apion* 1.37–43 (written sometime in the 90s CE), lists the books "justly accredited"; they number twenty-two, and include the Law (five books), the Prophets (thirteen books), and "the remaining four," which certainly include Psalms and Proverbs, and perhaps Job and Ecclesiastes. In all the lists, the Torah or Five Books of Moses are without doubt authoritative. The Prophets, including the historical books, probably refer to Joshua through Kings and Isaiah through Malachi. The last category, ben Sirach's "other books," certainly included Psalms and Proverbs. The remaining books, Job, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs and Esther, are questionable. Esther, in fact, did not win general acceptance in the Jewish community until the second century CE. So the concept of scriptural authority in the Second Temple Period was open, except in the case of the Torah or Pentateuch. The same situation obtains for the Qumran collection.

⁴ For a discussion of the formation of the canon, see, e.g., J. A. Sanders, "Canon, Hebrew Bible," *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, D. N. Freedman et al., eds. (New York: Doubleday, 1992) vol. 1, pp. 837–52, and the literature cited there.

James VanderKam has established a set of criteria by which to determine whether the Qumran Community considered a book authoritative.⁵ Although VanderKam 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 it as divinely inspired. Both of these functions, compositional intention and community acceptance, must be present for a work to be considered authoritative. By applying these criteria to the Qumran corpus, 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. Further, strong cases can be made for books not now considered canonical, such as *Enoch* and *Jubilees*. Thus, the term "Bible" in the category "Rewritten Bible" is anachronistic when applied to the Qumran collection.

The second objection that can be raised is that, as the work of Cross, Talmon, Ulrich, Tov, and others has shown,⁶

5 J. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994) p. 150.

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

the text of those books we term “biblical” was not fixed in this period, but pluriform. That is, a certain amount of fluidity in the transmission of the text of the books was both expected and accepted, and minor variants between versions did not affect the authority of the particular text. Therefore, the term “rewritten” can be called into question as well, for if a fixed text does not exist, can it be rewritten? Thus, the category itself is slippery, since there is at Qumran no easy dividing line between biblical and nonbiblical, authoritative and non-authoritative texts. In fact, it is possible that over the period in which the collection was made, the status of some books shifted, perhaps being accorded a high status at first and then falling out of favor. It would be wise, then, to keep in mind that the term “Rewritten Bible” is an anachronism when discussing the Qumran corpus, useful only for modern readers attempting to categorize and separate these texts, and not a category that would have had much meaning for the ancient reader.

Now, having both defined and raised objections to the category of “Rewritten Bible,” which texts found at Qumran best fit the description? For the purposes of this article, we will concentrate on those texts which reuse the Torah (the Pentateuch) rather than the Prophets or the Writings. There are two texts which clearly exhibit a close attachment to the text of the Pentateuch in narrative and/or themes, while also containing straightforward evidence of the reworking of that text for theological reasons. They are *Jubilees* and the *Temple Scroll*. Two other texts may also fit into this category, although their presence there may be disputed: *4QReworked Pentateuch* and the *Genesis Apocryphon*. Other, smaller texts may also fit into the “Rewritten Bible” category, but they will not be considered here.⁷

7 A good example of this type of text is 4QpesherGenesis^a, recently published by George Brooke. It seems to combine a rewritten Bible base text with pesher-type exegesis. G. Brooke, “4QCommentary on Genesis A,” *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*, E. Tov et al., eds. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996) 22.18–208, pls. XII–XIII.

The Temple Scroll

The *Temple Scroll*, found in Cave 11 in 1956, is the longest complete scroll found at Qumran, being 7.94 meters long in its present condition. It consists of nineteen sheets of leather preserving sixty-seven columns of text; the scroll is written in Hebrew by two scribes, scribe A copying col. 1–5 and scribe B the remaining columns. Its editor, Yigael Yadin, assigned a date of the Herodian period (late first century BCE) to the handwriting of the scroll.⁸ In addition to the large scroll from Cave 11, one or possibly two other copies were found in Cave 11 (11QTemple^{b,c?}); further, fragments were found in Cave 4 which overlap with portions of the *Temple Scroll*, although they are not copies of the Cave 11 manuscript (4Q365^a and 4Q542).⁹

The *Temple Scroll* presents itself as a direct revelation from God (speaking in the first person) to Moses, who functions as a silent audience. That the recipient is Moses is clear from the reference in col. 54 to “thy brother Aaron.” The text is a collection of halakhot (laws), which cover the following topics:

| | |
|-------------|-------------------------------|
| col. 2 | the covenant relationship |
| cols. 3–12 | the Temple building and altar |
| cols. 13–29 | feasts and sacrifices |
| cols. 30–44 | the Temple courts |
| cols. 45–47 | the sanctity of the holy city |

8 Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (vols. 1–3; Heb.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977; rev. Eng. ed.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983).

9 11QTemple^b: F. García Martínez, “11QTemple^b. A Preliminary Publication,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18–21 March 1991*, J. Treballe Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner, eds. (Leiden: Brill, 1992) vol. 2, pp. 363–92. 4QTemple? (4Q365a): S. White, “4QTemple?” in *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XIII*, J. VanderKam et al., eds. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994). 4Q542: E. Puech, “Fragments du plus ancien exemplaire du Rouleau du Temple (4Q542),” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten*, M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen, eds. (Leiden: Brill, 1997) pp. 19–66.

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| cols. 48–51:10 | purity laws |
| cols. 51:11–56:11 | various laws on legal procedure, sacrifices, and idolatry |
| cols. 56:12–59 | the law of the king |
| cols. 60–67 | various legal prescriptions ¹⁰ |

The *Temple Scroll*'s halakhic position exhibits a particular ideology, especially in the laws regarding the purity of the Temple. So, for example, defecation is not allowed within the holy city ("And you shall make them a place for a 'hand,' outside the city, to which they shall go out, to the northwest of the city— roofed houses with pits in them, into which the excrement will descend, {so that} it will {not} be visible at any distance from the city, three thousand cubits." col. 46:13–16), nor is sexual intercourse ("And if a man lies with his wife and has an emission of semen, he shall not come into any part of the city of the Temple, where I will settle my name, for three days." col. 45:11–12). These purity laws were meant to safeguard the sanctity of the Temple.

Many of the halakhic provisions of the *Temple Scroll* are interesting for their unusual nature. The architectural plan the scroll outlines for the Temple differs from the biblical accounts of either the First or the Second Temple, as well as differing from the descriptions of the Second Temple by Josephus or the Mishnah. The festival calendar includes a number of festivals not found in the Torah or rabbinic literature, for example, the festival of New Wine and New Oil. The Law of the King contains several unique provisions, including the prohibition of royal polygamy and the subordination of the king to the High Priest in matters of war. It should be recalled that all of this material is presented as a direct revelation from God.

The question of the sectarian nature of the *Temple Scroll* is a vexed one. As has often been remarked, the *Temple Scroll* contains no overtly sectarian language as is found in other Qumran documents: a community with a distinct hierarchical structure, predestination, dualism, or a new covenant.

10 See S. W. Crawford, "Temple Scroll," in *Dictionary of Judaism in the Biblical Period*, J. Neusner and W. S. Green, eds. (New York: Macmillan 1996).

However, the scroll does have clear commonalities with some of the Qumran texts which have been identified as sectarian, e.g., the *Damascus Document* and the *Nahum Commentary*. It espouses a solar calendar, and a strict interpretation of the Torah. In addition, several smaller details of the *Temple Scroll* show affinity with other Qumran documents. The festival of New Oil and the Wood Festival appear in *4QReworked Pentateuch* (a text which, like 11QT_{Temple}, may not be Qumranic in origin), and in 4QMMT,¹¹ sexual intercourse is forbidden in the holy city. In *Damascus Document* 12:1–2, the purity laws for the holy city are similar to the camp rules of the War Scroll, and consanguinity between uncle and niece is forbidden in both the *Temple Scroll* and the *Damascus Document*. Therefore, it seems likely that the *Temple Scroll*, while not a strictly sectarian composition, is part of an older body of material (which would also include books such as *Jubilees*) inherited and used by the sectaries.

Our interest lies in the *Temple Scroll*'s reuse of the biblical text to create a new document that is placed, not in the mouth of Moses, but in the mouth of God Himself. From the beginning of *Temple Scroll* studies, the redactor's reuse of the biblical material and the methods by which he reused it have been noted by commentators. Yigael Yadin, the scroll's original editor, gave a complete listing of the contents of the scroll, along with its main biblical sources, which include Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, 1 Samuel, 2 Samuel, 1 Kings, 2 Kings, 1 Chronicles, 2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Joel, and Song of Songs, with the preponderance of sources being Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy.¹² In fact, the last seven columns of the scroll adhere very closely to the text of Deuteronomy. Yadin also enumerated the ways in which the author of the *Temple Scroll* reused the biblical passages: formulation of the text in the first person, merging of

11 E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, "Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah," *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994) 10.45.

12 Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, vol. 1, pp. 46–70.

commands on the same subject, unifying duplicate commands (harmonization), modifications and additions designed to clarify the halakhic meaning of the commands, and appending whole new sections.¹³

Michael Wise, in his source-critical study of the *Temple Scroll*, posits that the redactor drew on several sources, including a Deuteronomy Source, a Temple Source, a Midrash to Deuteronomy Source, and a Festival Calendar.¹⁴ All of these sources are dependent, to a greater or lesser extent, on the biblical text. Wise also notes that the redactor of the *Temple Scroll* is particularly dependent on Deuteronomy 12–26.¹⁵

Finally, Dwight Swanson, in his recent and excellent monograph on the subject, lists the biblical sources used by the redactor of the *Temple Scroll* and the literary devices used to mold the biblical material into an entirely new composition.¹⁶ Both halves of this statement are important. First, the author or redactor (depending on one's view of his compositional activity) extensively reused the already authoritative text of the Torah and other biblical books. Anyone with any familiarity with the texts of the Bible would have, presumably, recognized this reuse. Second, however, in the process of this reuse, he created a new work, one that was the ultimate pseudepigraph, claiming as it did God for its author. How did the author view this text, and how did the Community which preserved it understand it?

According to Swanson, the author of the *Temple Scroll* viewed his text as authoritative and believed it would be accepted as such. "The author of the scroll appears to see his work within the continuing tradition of reinterpreting biblical tradition for a new era, with every expectation of its being accepted with the same

13 Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, vol. 1, pp. 71–88.

14 M. Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11* (SAOC 49: Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 1990).

15 Wise, *Critical Study of the Temple Scroll*, p. 162.

16 D. Swanson, *The Temple Scroll and the Bible: The Methodology of 11QT* (Leiden: Brill, 1995).

authority as that which preceded it.”¹⁷ If this contention is correct, then the *Temple Scroll* meets VanderKam’s first criterion for authoritative status, self-presentation.

Did the *Temple Scroll*, however, win community acceptance as authoritative, at least by the Qumran Community? Here the evidence is less clear. Yadin was unequivocal: “it [the *Temple Scroll*] was conceived and accepted by the Essene community as a sacred canonical [sic] work.”¹⁸ Others have sharply disagreed with this assessment. Hartmut 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*.”¹⁹ Therefore, Stegemann argues, it is not “scripture” for the Community. What can be said regarding the *Temple Scroll*’s authoritative status at Qumran? First, it is clear that many of the halakhic positions and theological notions expressed in the *Temple Scroll* were congenial to the Qumran Community and repeated in other documents found there (see above). However, 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. Therefore, it does not meet VanderKam’s second criterion for authoritative status, clear community acceptance. Therefore, while it is entirely plausible that the *Temple Scroll* was accepted as authoritative by the Qumran Community at some point in its history, we do not have any positive evidence that absolutely proves the case. The question thus must remain open.

17 Swanson, *Temple Scroll*, p. 6.

18 Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll: The Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect* (New York: Random House, 1985) p. 68.

19 H. Stegemann, “The Literary Composition of the Temple Scroll and its Status at Qumran,” in *Temple Scroll Studies*, G. Brooke, ed. (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989) pp. 127–128.

Jubilees

The book of *Jubilees*, which is an extensive reworking of Genesis 1 – Exodus 12, was found in fourteen or fifteen copies in five caves at Qumran.²⁰ Like the *Temple Scroll*, the author of *Jubilees* had a specific purpose in mind when he reworked the biblical text; the book presupposes and advocates the use of the 364-day solar calendar, and 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.²¹ The author used several techniques in his reuse of the biblical material: sometimes he quotes it verbatim, but more often it is at least recast to show that the “angel of the presence” is actually dictating this material to Moses on Sinai (cf. *Jub* 1:27 and 2:1). The author also condenses, omits, changes, and, most frequently, adds.²² The purpose of most of the changes to the biblical text is quite clear. For example, since the author wishes to present Abraham as a model of righteousness, the episode in which Abraham passes Sarah off as his sister, with the consequence that she is taken into Pharaoh’s harem, is omitted (Gen 12:10–10), with instead a rather innocuous note that “Pharaoh took Sarai, the wife of Abram” (*Jub* 13:13).

The additions to the biblical text can be quite extensive. They most frequently function to establish the religious festivals according to the chronology of the solar calendar, or to

20 J. C. VanderKam, “The Jubilee Fragments from Qumran Cave 4,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18–21 March 1991*, J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner, eds. (Leiden: Brill, 1992) vol. 2, p. 648.

21 For a convenient English translation of *Jubilees*, see O. S. Wintermute, “*Jubilees*,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, J. H. Charlesworth, ed. (New York: Doubleday, 1985) vol. 2, pp. 35–142.

22 Wintermute, *OTP*, 2.35.

depict the patriarchs properly observing the Torah.²³ For example, *Jubilees* 16 portrays Abraham celebrating the Feast of Booths at Beersheba. The extensive additions, as well as the clear ideological bias in favor of the solar calendar, make *Jubilees* a completely new work. Anyone at all familiar with the texts of Genesis and Exodus would have immediately recognized that this was a different work. Once again, we ask the question of how the author meant the work to be perceived, and how it was perceived by the group that preserved it.

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, as well as in the very fragmentary 4Q228,²⁴ 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 an authority; the fragments from Qumran make it clear that *Jubilees* claims to be dictated by an angel of the presence to Moses.²⁵ Thus, 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. This conclusion indicates that our categories of canonical and noncanonical must be put aside when investigating the Qumran literature, as well as any notion of a fixed, unchangeable biblical text. The text could be changed, in the case of *Jubilees*, quite extensively, and the resulting work accepted as authoritative.

23 G. E. Nickelsburg, "The Bible Rewritten and Expanded," *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT, section 2; Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Van Gorcum and Fortress, 1984) p. 97.

24 J. VanderKam and J. T. Milik, "4QText with a Citation of Jubilees," DJD 13.177–86, pl. XII.

25 VanderKam, *Madrid*, pp. 646–47.

4QReworked Pentateuch

4QReworked Pentateuch appears in five manuscripts from Cave 4, Qumran: 4Q158, 4Q364, 4Q365, 4Q366, and 4Q367.²⁶ The manuscripts preserve portions of the Torah from Genesis through Deuteronomy. The redactor's method in creating his composition is transparent; he began with a base text of the Torah which, where it can be determined for 4Q364 and probably 4Q365, was the proto-Samaritan text,²⁷ then reworked the text in various ways, most notably by regrouping passages according to a common theme and by adding previously unknown material into the text. Two examples will suffice: in 4Q366, frag. 4, col. 1, the following pericopes concerning the Sukkoth festival are grouped together: Num 29:32–30:1 and Deut 16:13–14:

[And on the seventh day, seven steers, t]w[o rams, fourteen sound year-old lambs, and their cereal offering and their drink offering for the steers, the rams, and the lamb]s according to thei[r] number[according to the commandment; and one he-[go]at for the sin-offering, besides

26 J. M. Allegro, "Qumran Cave 4: I (4Q158–4Q186)" in *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert V* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968) pp. 1–6; plate 1. Tov and White, DJD 13. M. Segal has recently argued that 4Q158 should not be classified as a manuscript of 4QRP, but is a separate composition. See his forthcoming paper, "4QReworked Pentateuch or 4QPentateuch?" in *The Dead Sea Scrolls—Fifty Years After Their Discovery, Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 10–25, 1997*, L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J. VanderKam, eds. (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society). However, if I am correct in arguing that 4QRP is the result of scribal intervention into 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 overlaps among the five manuscripts must be taken into consideration; for a listing, see Tov, "Introduction," DJD 13.190–191, and "4QReworked Pentateuch: A Synopsis of its Contents," *RevQ* 16 (1995) p. 653.

27 Tov, DJD 13.192–96.

[the continual burnt offering, and its cereal offering and its drink offering.]

[And on the eighth day there will be a solemn assembly for you;] you will not do[any work of la]bor. And you will present to Yahweh an offering [by fire, a pleasing odor; one steer, one ram, s]even sound lambs a year old,) and their cereal offering and their drink offerings [for the steer and the ram and the lambs according to their number according to the commandment, and one he-goat for a sin-]offering, besides the continual burnt offering, its cereal offering [and its drink offering. These you shall do for Yahweh on your festivals, besides] your[votive-]offerings and your voluntary offerings, for your burnt offerings and your cereal offerings [and your drink offerings and your peace offerings. And Moses spoke] to the children of Israel according to all which Yahweh commanded [Moses.]

[A festival of booths you shall make for yourself seven days, when you gather from] your [threshing floor] and from your wine vat. And you will rejoice in your festival, you and your son . . .

Since the text is fragmentary, it is possible that a third text, Lev 23:34–43, would have been placed here as well. This pericope appears in 4Q365, followed by a large addition. An example of an addition occurs in 4Q365, frag. 6, where, following Exod 15:21, a seven-line “Song of Miriam” has been inserted to fill a perceived gap in the text:²⁸

1. you despised [
2. for the majesty of [
3. You are great, a deliverer [
4. the hope of the enemy has perished, and he is
for[gotten
5. they perished in the might waters, the enemy [
6. Extol the one who raises up, [a r]ansom . . . you gave [
7. [the one who do]es gloriously

In neither case, nor in any of the other reworkings of the biblical text, does the author/redactor leave any physical indication, such as a scribal mark, that this is changed or new

28 Tov and White, DJD 13.269–72.

material.²⁹ 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); next the expanded texts in the proto-Samaritan tradition such as 4QpaleoExod^m and 4QNum^b; and then finally the most expanded text of all, *4QReworked Pentateuch*. Thus, Eugene Ulrich had contended that 4QRP is not a new composition, but rather a variant literary edition of the Pentateuch, and was perceived as such by the Community which preserved it.³⁰

However, the question of 4QRP’s function and status in the Community which preserved it is not entirely clear. Once again using VanderKam’s criteria, it is apparent that 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

29 Of course, all five manuscripts are fragmentary, so this claim is not absolutely certain. It should be noted that in 4Q366 there is a *vacat* (empty space) between Num 30:1 and Deut 16:13.

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

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 Rebecca the mother of Jacob and Esau." The expansion, for which we do not possess the beginning, concerns Rebecca's grief over the departing Jacob and Isaac's consolation of her:

1. him you shall see [
2. you shall see in peace [
3. your death, and to your eyes [. . . lest I be deprived of
even]
4. the two of you. And [Isaac] called [to Rebecca his wife
and he told]
5. her all [these] wor[ds]
6. after Jacob her son[and she cried

The text then continues with Gen 28:6. The expansion found here in 4QRP echoes a similar expansion in *Jubilees* 27, where Rebecca grieves after her departing son and Isaac consoles her. In 4Q364 the phrases in question are "him you shall see" (l: 1), "you shall see in peace" (l: 2), and "after Jacob her son" (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 Qumran³¹). 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*).³² If that

31 J. VanderKam and J. T. Milik, "Jubilees," DJD 13.1–186, pls. I–XII.

32 However, G. Nickelsburg has called my attention to the fact that Tob 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

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 to the author of *Jubilees* at least the text had some status.³³

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, festivals also found in the *Temple Scroll*.

4. saying, when you come to the land which
5. I am giving to you for an inheritance, and you dwell
upon it securely, you will bring wood for a burnt
offering and for all the wo[r]k of
6. [the H]ouse which you will build for me in the land, to
arrange it upon the altar of burnt-offering, and the
calv[es]
7.] for Passover sacrifices and for whole burnt-offerings
and for thank offerings and for free-will offerings
and for burnt-offerings, daily [
8.] and for the doors and for all the work of the House
the[y] will br[ing]
9.] the [fe]stival of fresh oil. They will bring wood two [

him on the day when he returns to you in peace." Unfortunately, most of this passage is not extant in 4QTobit^b, so a direct comparison is not possible (cf. J. Fitzmyer, "Tobit," in *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* XIX, J. VanderKam et al., eds. [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995] pp. 1–76, pls. 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: Doubleday; 1996] pp. 40–42). I would like to thank Nickelsburg for calling this reference to my attention.

33 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 incorporates similar material into his leave-taking scene, then the argument for a common fund of material is strengthened.

10.] the ones who bring on the fir[st] day, Levi [
 11. Reu]ben and Simeon [and on t]he fou[rth] day [

In fact, as was first noted in print by Yadin, material in frag. 23 is parallel to cols. 23–24 of the *Temple Scroll*.³⁴

1. [. . . and on the first day Levi] and Judah, and on [the second day Benjamin]
2. [and the sons of Joseph, and on the third day Reuben and Simeon, and] on the fourth day Iss[achar and Zebulon]
3. [and on the fifth day Gad and Asher, and on the sixth day Dan] and Naphtali [

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.³⁵ The decisive parallel, which points to a definite relationship, is the order of the tribes bringing the wood for the Wood Festival, an order which occurs only here in 4QRP and in the *Temple Scroll*, and nowhere else. The question of concern is whether one text is citing or alluding to the other. J. Strugnell, the original editor of 4QRP, suggested the possibility,³⁶ and H. Stegemann has argued outright that 4QRP is a source for the *Temple Scroll*.³⁷ M. Wise believed that frag. 23, for which he did not have the context of the rest of 4Q365, was part of his “Deuteronomy Source” for the *Temple Scroll*.³⁸ What is important for our purposes is that it is the unique material in 4QRP that is paralleled in the *Temple Scroll*. It is possible, of course, that the two works are drawing on a common fund of tradition, but

34 Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, vol. 2, p. 103.

35 See my article “Three Fragments from Qumran Cave 4 and their Relationship to the Temple Scroll,” *JQR* 85 (1994) pp. 259–73.

36 As quoted by B. Z. Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1983) pp. 205–06.

37 H. Stegemann, “The Literary Composition of the Temple Scroll and its Status at Qumran,” in *Temple Scroll Studies*, G. Brooke, ed. (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989) p. 135.

38 Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll*, pp. 58–59.

that tradition is hypothetical, and the fact that both documents were found at Qumran makes a closer relationship more likely. Thus, it once again 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. 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, although the evidence from 4Q365, frag. 23, may point in that direction.

To return to the criteria for authority, the third criterion, "Is the book the subject of a commentary?" is not met by 4QRP. Thus, 4QRP, by failing to meet, beyond a reasonable doubt, the second and third criteria, does not meet the second large 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 testifies to the importance of and fascination with the books of the Pentateuch in various forms in Second Temple Judaism, as exemplified by the Qumran Community. What is lacking, however, for 4QRP is the desirable instance of absolutely certain citation; thus, our caution concerning its authoritative status, similar to our caution concerning the *Temple Scroll*.

The *Genesis Apocryphon*

With the *Genesis Apocryphon* we move slightly outside the genre confines established above, for the *Genesis Apocryphon*, unlike the three works already discussed, was composed in Aramaic.³⁹

39 The *Genesis Apocryphon* was found in one copy in Cave I. Its composition probably dates to the middle of the 2nd century BCE. For the first publication, see N. Avigad and Y. Yadin., *A Genesis Apocryphon*. (Jerusa-

Thus, it is not only a rewriting of the biblical narrative, but a translation. As such, it could not maintain the fiction that it was written by or dictated to Moses (4QRP, *Jubilees*), much less spoken by God (*Temple Scroll*). Therefore, the question of authority is less important for the *Genesis Apocryphon*, since it does not, as far as can be determined from the extant columns, attempt to present itself as authoritative. However, the *Genesis Apocryphon* has several important connections to the book of *Jubilees* as well as other texts found at Qumran,⁴⁰ and testifies to the vast collection of exegetical material available on the text of the Pentateuch, some of which was incorporated into the Rewritten Bible texts.

The *Genesis Apocryphon* is extant in twenty-one fragmentary columns, the best-preserved of which are cols. 2 and 19–22. The narrative in column 2 begins with the story of Lamech (Gen 5:28) and ends in the midst of the story of Abraham (Gen 15:1–4). The author freely paraphrases his Hebrew base text, often recasting the narrative in the first person singular, to tell the story from the point of view of the main character. Numerous parallels with the book of *Jubilees* indicate that the author of the *Genesis Apocryphon* may have used *Jubilees* as a source.⁴¹ But, while the author of *Jubilees* uses his rewriting to drive home his halakhic position on the solar calendar and festivals, the author of the *Genesis Apocryphon* has no such agenda. In fact, he shows little interest in halakhah at all. Rather, his interest lies in the emotional drama of the text, and his sometimes extensive additions usually serve to heighten the dramatic tension dormant in the biblical story. A case in point is the contrasting ways in which *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon* handle the story of Abram and Sarai in Egypt (Gen 12:10–20). A problem with the Genesis story is

lem: Magnès, 1956). See also J. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I*. (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1971 [2nd ed.]).

40 Most notably *1 Enoch*.

41 See Nickelsburg, "Bible Rewritten and Expanded," p. 106, and Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, pp. 16–17.

that Abram requests that Sarai lie about her relationship to him (Gen 12:12–13). This is a troubling peccadillo in the otherwise upright and righteous Abraham. *Jubilees* deals with the problem by simply omitting it: Abram and Sarai enter Egypt and Sarai is taken willy-nilly by the Pharaoh:

And Abram went into Egypt in the third year of the week and he stayed in Egypt five years before his wife was taken from him. And Tanis of Egypt was built then, seven years after Hebron. And it came to pass when Pharaoh took Sarai, the wife of Abram, that the Lord plagued Pharaoh and his house with great plagues on account of Sarai, the wife of Abram. (*Jub* 13:11–13)

The *Genesis Apocryphon*, on the other hand, adds into the text a dream of Abraham, in which he foresees what will happen and what should be done:

I, Abram, dreamt a dream, on the night of my entry into Egypt. And in my dream I saw a cedar and a palm-tree. . . . Some men arrived intending to cut and uproot the cedar, leaving the palm-tree alone. But the palm-tree shouted and said: Do not hew down the cedar, because both of us are of the same family. And the cedar was saved thanks to the palm-tree, and was not hewn down. I woke up from my slumber during the night and said to Sarai, my wife: I have had a nightmare [. . . and] I am alarmed by this dream. She said to me: Tell me your dream so that I may know it. And I began to tell her the dream. [And I let her know the interpretation] of the dream. I said: [. . .] they want to kill me and leave you alone. This favor only [must you do for me]: every time we [reach a place, say] about me: He is my brother. And I shall live under your protection and my life will be spared because of you. [. . .] they will try to separate you from me and kill me. Sarai wept because of my words that night. (*Gen Apoc* 19:14–21)

The implication of the text is that dreams are given by God, and Sarai's lie is thus divinely sanctioned. Abram and Sarai therefore become more human and interesting characters. In its emphasis on the human drama, the *Genesis Apocryphon* is similar to other Aramaic texts from Qumran such as Tobit, the

Prayer of Nabonidus, and *Tales of the Persian Court*,⁴² which are stories or tales, interested in the human element and not in technical questions of halakhah. But the *Genesis Apocryphon* is dependent on its biblical base text for its essential plot structure and themes, and thus has a foot in both genres.

Conclusion

The *Temple Scroll*, *Jubilees*, *4QReworked Pentateuch*, and the *Genesis Apocryphon* are all related to one another, first by the mere fact that they were all found in the caves at Qumran, and second by the fact that all four are closely related to the Torah, 4QRP as the product of scribal intervention resulting in an expanded text, the *Temple Scroll* and *Jubilees* as more thorough reworkings with theological agendas, and the *Genesis Apocryphon* as a translation and haggadic rewriting. The connections, however, are even more significant: 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*.⁴³ In addition, as stated above, it is possible that both the *Temple Scroll* and *Jubilees* draw on 4QRP as a source, while the *Genesis Apocryphon* probably knew *Jubilees*. As VanderKam has stated concerning *Jubilees* and the *Temple Scroll*, “the authors of the two are drawing upon the same exegetical, cultic tradition.”⁴⁴ To these two texts I would add 4QRP and the

42 For a convenient English translation of these texts, see F. García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated* (Leiden: Brill, 1992) pp. 293–300, 289, 291–92.

43 J. VanderKam, “The Temple Scroll and the Book of Jubilees,” in *Temple Scroll Studies*, G. Brooke, ed. (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989) p. 216.

44 J. VanderKam, “The Temple Scroll and the Book of Jubilees,” p. 232.

Genesis Apocryphon.⁴⁵ This common tradition, evinced by four 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.

45 The *Books of Enoch*, to which at least *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon* have extensive parallels, could be drawn into the discussion as well, but unfortunately that is beyond the scope of this paper.