

Rethinking Rewritten Scripture

Composition and Exegesis
in the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts

By
Molly M. Zahn



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2011

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

The foregoing chapters have provided a wealth of detailed information concerning the ways in which pentateuchal material is reworked in the 4QRP MSS, SP, and TS. In what follows I will pull together some of the various topical threads that have run through this work, highlighting how the detailed textual analysis has advanced our understanding of the texts I have examined, and returning to address the broader questions concerning exegesis, composition, and textual authority that I raised at the start of this study.

6.1 A CLEARER UNDERSTANDING OF THE TEXTS

The previous chapters have, I hope, demonstrated that great strides can be made in the discussion concerning textual reworking in the late Second Temple period by examining the pertinent texts in detail as opposed to dealing in generalities. This study's most salient contribution in this regard is a more nuanced picture of how the various texts resemble one another and how they differ. On the one hand, with the exception of the very fragmentary 4Q366 and 4Q367, all of the texts examined here made use of virtually the same compositional techniques.¹ On the other hand, in-depth analysis illustrates the extent to which each manuscript possesses a distinctive profile: no two manuscripts were alike in the proportions in which they used various compositional techniques or in the purposes to which they put these techniques.

For the 4QRP MSS, instead of a single composition in multiple copies or even a closely affiliated group of texts, the picture emerges of a diverse collection of manuscripts that show some similarities, but also differ in important ways. 4Q366 and 4Q367, despite their extremely poor preservation, show a special predilection towards presenting

¹ The one compositional technique that did not occur in all the major manuscripts considered here is 'replacement with material from elsewhere,' which was restricted to SP except for one very minor case in TS.

biblical laws in new sequences. 4Q365 contains proportionately more new material than any of the other texts except TS. Its concern with the construction of a Temple complex, which indicates some sort of literary relationship between it and TS, is of course unique among the 4QRP mss. 4Q365 also shows a concern with sequence, though in contrast to 4Q366 and 4Q367 its two major changes of sequence seem to pertain more to narrative than to law.² 4Q158, on the other hand, seems especially concerned to build textual bridges between related pericopes. In order to accomplish this goal, it alone of the 4QRP mss frequently employs large additions of material from elsewhere. 4Q364 becomes distinctive in its own way by apparently failing to put particular emphasis on any one compositional technique or compositional goal. Although it contains a variety of additions and other changes, some not precisely identifiable, 4Q364 preserves proportionately fewer substantial changes than any of the other 4QRP mss, and shows no sign of any particular editorial concern.

The Samaritan Pentateuch has often been held up as a foil to the 4QRP mss: while the 4QRP editors felt free to add new materials in the course of their reworking, the editors responsible for SP used only the text of the Pentateuch itself.³ As chapter 4 illustrates, an in-depth look at instances of substantial difference between SP and other versions results in a somewhat more complex picture. It is true that addition of new material in SP and its forebears rarely exceeds more than a few words, and never exceeds more than a single verse. It is also true that the most prominent changes in SP are additions of material from elsewhere, in which large blocks of pentateuchal text are repeated in a new location. However, my investigation showed that every type of compositional technique evidenced by the 4QRP mss save one—paraphrase—appeared in SP and its forebears. These techniques were deployed for a wide variety of purposes, including improved clarity,

² The case of the juxtaposition of Numbers 27 and 36 is not easily classified as ‘legal’ or ‘narrative’—the two pericopes deal with the same legal issue and thus their juxtaposition might be seen as reflecting a concern for topical arrangement of law. Yet insofar as the legal issue is framed as a series of appeals to Moses for adjudication, the context is narrative and the juxtaposition could reflect a concern to bring together parts of the storyline that belong together. Perhaps it is best to say simply that, in this case, topical and narrative concerns overlap. Cf. the statement of Moshe Bernstein that here “it is the narrative which appears to govern the sequence and arrangement of the texts”; Bernstein, “What Has Happened to the Laws,” 36.

³ See e.g. Tov, “Rewritten Bible Compositions,” 339; Segal, “4QReworked Pentateuch,” 394; Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 13; Sanderson, *Exodus Scroll*, 271.

lexical harmonization, and to reflect particular exegetical decisions about the text. Furthermore, the most prominent feature of SP and its forebears, the major additions of material from elsewhere, occurs in very specific situations pertaining to very specific types of speech. In other words, instead of taking the major additions from elsewhere in SP as a sign of the text's conservatism, we should take them as indications of a specific exegetical concern on the part of the editors responsible for the text, a concern similar though not identical to the hermeneutical approach seen in 4Q158. Finally, the one compositional technique that occurs in SP but not in the 4QRP MSS, replacement with material from elsewhere, can even be regarded as more radical than anything found in the 4QRP MSS, since it involves omission of pentateuchal material on a scale not clearly attested in the 4QRP MSS.⁴ SP and its forebears thus reflect a tradition of pentateuchal revision that should be regarded less as a foil to the 4QRP MSS than as another set of witnesses to the same basic process: the revision of the Pentateuch according to a standard set of compositional techniques, but with particular emphases and goals.

The Temple Scroll, on the face of it, is the most distinctive of the texts examined in this study. Although certainty is difficult because of the fragmentary state of the 4QRP MSS, TS appears to contain larger amounts of new material than any of the other texts, and appears to apply techniques like paraphrase and rearrangement more frequently and consistently than the other texts. Also distinctive in its scope is the use in TS of the pentateuchal text—whether drawn from a specific passage or from the characteristic vocabulary of a particular pentateuchal source—to generate new text.⁵ But the extent and intricacy of scriptural reworking in TS should not obscure the similarities between it and the 4QRP MSS. As I indicated in the previous chapter, TS often presents in a clearer way types of reworking that appear only ambiguously in the fragmentary 4QRP MSS.⁶ Even as TS seems to go far beyond the other texts in its creative reformulation of the Pentateuch, it clearly employs the same techniques, and often addresses the same sorts of issues, as

⁴ It should be kept in mind, however, that some of the 4QRP MSS *may* have omitted a great deal more material, depending upon how we understand the nature of juxtapositions such as that of Numbers 27 and 36 in 4Q365. See above, section 3.2.6.

⁵ The extent to which this extraordinary level of reworking is the result of the presentation of TS as a direct divine revelation from Sinai will be discussed below.

⁶ See the discussion in section 5.6 above.

the 4QRP mss. TS thus constitutes yet another distinctive use of a more widespread approach to revision of the pentateuchal text.

All of the (groups of) texts examined in this study have, in different ways, reminded us of the gradual or stepwise nature of the processes of reworking in the Second Temple period. Despite the distinctive profile of each of the 4QRP mss, there is little to suggest that all the changes in a given manuscript, or even all the major ones, should be attributed to a single redactor. Perhaps the best case can be made for a single main redactor in 4Q158, with its apparent interest in building connections between related passages, but even here the evidence is ambiguous.⁷ SP and its forebears might appear to provide more robust evidence for the role of a single prominent redactor, in that the most substantial changes in this group of manuscripts can be traced to a very particular exegetical perspective. Yet differences between SP itself and the pre-Samaritan texts from Qumran, as well as the frequency in SP of other types of more moderate change, make clear that this group of texts also reflects a process of development. Even for TS, which must at some point have been given its divine voicing and its particular organization vis-à-vis the Pentateuch by an individual redactor, we have some evidence for development in stages. In other words, though it is often most convenient to speak of rewritten texts as the product of a single scribe's revision of his *Vorlage*, this study has shown that, most often, the evidence suggests or at least allows for a more complex situation.

With this summary of how this investigation has enhanced our understanding of the texts, I wish to give priority neither to the similarities nor to the differences between them. In cases where differences have been emphasized in the past, such as the comparison between SP and its forebears, the 4QRP mss, and TS, noting the fundamental similarity in compositional techniques and often in the purposes served by the reworking represents an important corrective. By the same token, in cases where similarity has usually been assumed, such as in discussions of the five 4QRP mss, an adjustment of perspective is necessary that takes into account the considerable differences between the various manuscripts. Fundamentally, my goal has been to begin to replace generalizations with more detailed observations. As a result, in this final summation of results I will consciously resist oversimplification

⁷ See above, section 2.8.

even as I attempt to make sense of the broad range of information that derives from the textual analysis.

6.2 IMPLICATIONS

While part of the purpose of this study was simply to chart in detail the different methods of textual reworking in the 4QRP mss and related texts, it was undertaken in the hope that its results might shed light on broader questions pertaining to the rewriting of Scripture in the Second Temple period. The discussion in the Introduction indicated that the relationship between three different processes or issues remains in need of clarification: the mechanics of textual reworking/compositional technique, the particular exegetical or ideological purpose(s) served by the reworking, and the status or nature of the composition (in the eyes of its author or its audience). The possible interactions between these three issues can be formulated in a series of questions: Can particular compositional techniques be associated with particular interpretive goals? Do particular compositional techniques *or* particular ways of using those techniques correlate with the status of a rewritten work as either a new copy or edition of a biblical book or as a new, 'extrabiblical' composition? Finally, to return to the issue of a 'continuum,' (how) does the *amount* of reworking influence the perceived or intended status of a rewritten work? I will consider each of these questions in turn as a way of drawing out some of the larger implications of this study.

6.2.1 *Compositional Techniques and Interpretive Goals*

Since in this study I have both looked at the compositional techniques utilized in the various texts and attempted to identify the reasons behind or motivations for particular changes, the question can now be asked whether there is any correlation between individual compositional techniques and specific interpretive goals. That is, do additions, for instance, tend to accomplish any particular purpose, or are they used in a wide variety of contexts for a variety of reasons?

It is perhaps to be expected that some compositional techniques, especially additions of new material, minor alterations, and paraphrase, appear to serve a wide variety of purposes. In contrast to other types of changes that I will discuss below, these compositional techniques are quite 'open' in the sense that there is little or no limitation inherent

in the technique itself on how it is used. Thus, minor additions and alterations accomplish quite a variety of interpretive goals, including grammatical or lexical clarification, hermeneutical or halakhic updating, and harmonization of one passage to another. Similarly, larger additions sometimes serve to fill perceived gaps (the new blessing in 4Q158 frag. 1–2; the note about the making of the Urim and Thummim in SP Exod 28:30), sometimes introduce new law (TS *passim*; the wood offering in 4Q365 frag. 23), and sometimes may simply reflect creative elaboration (e.g. the addition pertaining to Jacob’s flight to Aram in 4Q364 3 ii). Paraphrase is a somewhat poorly-defined category in the 4QRP mss and does not appear at all in SP, but it is still evident that this technique could serve a variety of purposes. Rewording can unify parallel passages (as in TS’s passover law in col. 17), can make one passage more closely resemble another (as in TS’s incest laws in col. 66 or 4Q158 frag. 14’s rewording of Exodus 6 in light of Exodus 15), or can clarify or update the wording of a passage (as apparently in the paraphrase of Deut 2:34 in 4Q364 frag. 24). These techniques in a way constitute a toolkit or palette of colors which the rewriter can use to create whatever meaning is deemed necessary.

Other compositional techniques, however, are less open—they are more ‘bound’ in the sense that the technique itself limits to some extent the types of interpretive decisions that it can express. For example, addition of material from elsewhere by definition requires that its use create a repetition of some sort. Thus *a priori*, especially in narrative contexts, use of this technique points in the direction of some sort of coordination or harmonization of two (or more) passages. Similarly, the technique of rearrangement almost automatically implies an exegetical concern pertaining to sequence, since rearrangement—the alteration of sequence—implies dissatisfaction with the sequence of the source text as it stands.

Nevertheless, even these inherently ‘bound’ techniques are used for a great variety of purposes in the texts examined here. Addition of material from elsewhere is especially interesting in this regard. We have seen that smaller additions from elsewhere overwhelmingly serve to harmonize two passages at the level of their syntax or, especially, their vocabulary. Larger additions from elsewhere have most often been regarded as the vehicle by which SP and its forebears carry out their paradigmatically ‘harmonistic’ editing of the pentateuchal text. On the one hand, we have seen that these types of changes in SP are not simply harmonistic, but reflect a special concern with the coordi-

nation of speech events and their consequences. On the other hand, 4Q158 and TS demonstrate that this same technique can function in many more ways than it does in SP. 4Q158 sometimes uses additions from elsewhere in contexts very similar to SP—e.g., a command without any notice of its fulfillment—but also uses the same technique less technically, to reinforce (not create) the connections between an event and its recollection or a command or promise and its fulfillment, and even to indicate textually an exegetical association between two disparate events. In TS, addition of material from elsewhere can serve as the basis for the creation of new law, as in the new firstfruits festivals that TS constructs on the basis of the Holiness Code’s instructions for the festival of Shavuot. In this legal situation, as opposed to narrative settings, the repetition does not create or reinforce a connection between two events. Instead, the redeployment of pentateuchal language situates the new law among its older predecessors, allowing the new law to partake of the authority of the original law by partaking of its language.⁸

Similar to addition of material from elsewhere, rearrangement can also function in a variety of ways, despite the inherent limitations of the technique. In other words, the texts examined here indicate that there are multiple reasons why an editor might wish to change the sequence of the source text. We see a concern to improve the *logic* of the sequence in 4Q365, 4Q366, and TS. The latter two texts each evidence a concern for the topical grouping of law: laws on similar subjects should not be scattered haphazardly, but occur together. In 4Q365, the concern for sequence applies to narrative: the logical progression of the storyline prompts the removal or relocation of irrelevant intervening material.⁹ Similarly, SP uses rearrangement to solve the logical difficulty of the Israelites “seeing the thunder” in Exod 20:18. In other instances, though, other criteria seem to cause the change of sequence. The two largest cases of rearrangement in SP are harmonistic in the sense that the new sequence conforms the text more closely to the sequence of a corresponding pericope. In the rearrangement of

⁸ The observation that TS reuses scriptural texts, even when composing new law, in order to appear ancient and authoritative was first made by Brin, “המקרא במגילת,” see especially p. 214. For further discussion of the relationship between TS’s claim to authority and its reworking of scriptural texts, see Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 45–46; Zahn, “New Voices,” 441–42; Paganini, *Rezeption*, 88–89.

⁹ On the difficulty of characterizing precisely the nature of the new sequences created in 4Q365, see section 3.2.6 above.

the Decalogue that seems to have taken place between 4Q158 frags. 6 and 7, the editor appears to respond to a wider exegetical issue: the problem of the mediation of the commandments and the shift from first- to third-person reference to God within the Decalogue.

All in all, then, the texts discussed in this study indicate the great diversity of purposes to which a relatively small number of compositional techniques can be put. Aside from minor additions of material from elsewhere, which do seem consistently to function to harmonize the language of two passages, other types of changes do not correlate with only one exegetical or ideological purpose. This is true even in cases, such as additions from elsewhere, where the number of uses to which a technique can be put is inherently limited.

Although this result may seem largely negative (i.e., there tends not to be a strong correlation between particular compositional techniques and the uses to which they are put), it clarifies in important ways one leg of the triangular system of interrelationships described above. Some compositional techniques allow almost unlimited freedom in terms of how they can be used; others permit a narrower range of options. Considering the range of uses to which a single technique is put in various texts provides a window into the 'tool kit' of Second Temple scribes as well as their creativity in employing the tools at their disposal.

6.2.2 *Compositional Techniques and the Status of a Rewritten Text*

The second question to consider is whether this study has shed any light on a possible connection between the compositional techniques used in a given text, or the purposes to which those compositional techniques were put, and the status of that text as either a copy of a biblical book or a new composition. That is, do scribes responsible for new compositions use different methods of reworking, or use the same methods in different ways, than those who simply revise and update biblical books?

A priori, a negative answer lies closest to hand based on the results described in the previous section. The texts considered here include one group readily acknowledged to constitute copies of the Pentateuch (SP and its forebears); one text representing a new composition (TS); and one group (the 4QRP mss) whose status is disputed, though I would incline to regarding them as copies of the Pentateuch. All of these texts share a basic set of compositional techniques, and although

different texts use different techniques for different purposes and in differing proportions, there is little clear evidence that would suggest a correlation between textual status and the methods and goals of textual reworking.

It is worth considering, however, whether TS might present some evidence for just such a correlation. That is, insofar as the author of TS rewrites the pentateuchal text for the purpose of creating a new composition that presents itself as divine revelation from Sinai, might we not regard some of the instances of reworking in TS as specifically contributing to this purpose and thus closely linked to the status of the text? In at least one case this is obviously true: TS contains a large number of minor alterations in which reference to God in the third person is transformed to first-person reference; thus יהוה often becomes אני, and so forth. This series of changes is the means by which the author creates the new divine voice for his work, a voice which helps to make clear that TS is not simply a copy of the legal sections of the Pentateuch, but a new composition. Yet this type of change is most profitably considered under the rubric of the theory that literary features like voice and setting are the primary ways by which authors signal that a text should be read as a new composition.¹⁰ It is approaching tautology to say that the author of a rewritten text constituting a new composition will use *rewriting* to change the literary features of the text to indicate that it is a new composition. To put it another way, since changes in voice and setting already indicate to us the possible status of a rewritten composition, we do not gain very much by saying that the use of particular compositional techniques for the purpose of changing voice or setting suggests that the work that does this sort of thing is likely a new composition.

Beyond these obvious changes in TS, however, there may be other distinctive features of its rewriting that owe their presence to TS's particular character. For example, alone of the texts considered here, TS shows concern to reduce the redundancy of law, often using paraphrase to combine parallel laws into a single piece of legislation (as we saw with the Passover and Mazzot laws). Might this use of paraphrase be motivated by TS's self-presentation as divine revelation, a context in which presumably redundancy would not be expected?

¹⁰ See above, section 1.2.

Bernard Levinson and I have suggested that some changes made by TS are made specifically with the purpose of supporting the text's Sinaitic claims, the logic being that, since the text purports to constitute God's direct speech from Mt. Sinai, the author's attempts to smooth out inconsistencies and redundancies in the pentateuchal text amount to an attempt to make TS's legal revelation fitting for the divinity through whom it is revealed.¹¹ Thus parts of TS's rewriting, such as reducing legal redundancy, may in fact be specifically connected to its new voice and setting, and thus to its status as a new composition.

Even if this is true, however, several factors should caution against trying to use the evidence of TS to formulate any sort of general principle regarding the relationship between compositional techniques or the purposes to which they are put and the status of the composition in which they occur. To begin with, the problems inherent in the pentateuchal text vis-à-vis the claim to direct divine revelation made by TS—namely, that the Pentateuch is contradictory and redundant—are equally relevant in the context of the transmission and revision of the pentateuchal text itself. We have seen many examples of attempts to smooth out the text in SP and in the 4QRP mss. TS presents itself as direct divine revelation, but the Pentateuch, at the time of the rewritings we are considering, was already starting to be read as divine revelation, with all the expectations of consistency that that perception entailed. If the author of TS 'improves' the text in order to make it better fit the claim that this new text is divinely revealed, other scribes, working on the text of the Pentateuch itself, made the same types of moves in order that the pentateuchal text itself might better reflect the claims of divinity and completeness being made of it.¹²

¹¹ Zahn, "New Voices," 442; Levinson and Zahn, "Revelation Regained," 308.

¹² The attitude towards the Torah to which changes like these attest bears a great deal of resemblance to the rabbinic conception of the Torah as perfect and all-encompassing; see Alexander Samely, "Scripture's Implicature: The Midrashic Assumptions of Relevance and Consistency," *JSS* 37 (1992): 167–205, at pp. 173–76, 192; Azzan Yadin, *Scripture as Logos: Rabbi Ishmael and the Origins of Midrash* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 45–47, 54–59. The difference, of course, is that these Second Temple scribes felt authorized to adjust the text of the Torah itself in light of their expectations. The rabbis, working with the fixed text that emerged in the late first century C.E., took another approach. As Samely and Yadin demonstrate, they essentially refused to regard redundancy and contradiction as such, instead viewing these textual features as hermeneutically generative; as clues to the Torah's proper interpretation.

To sum up this section, I would argue that TS shows that particular uses of compositional techniques *can* be related to the goals and purposes of a given text, and thus *can* be correlated in some way with the status of that text as new composition or copy of the Pentateuch. The evidence from TS, however, does not allow us to formulate specific criteria for what types of rewriting might shed light on the status of a text in other cases, because, even as TS positions itself as a new composition in literary terms, its claim to divine revelation mirrors the revealed status of the Pentateuch itself. On this question, then, more research is needed. Other rewritten texts need to be examined to determine the extent to which their use of particular compositional techniques interacts with other factors that influence our perception of their status, such as voice and setting. Perhaps it will emerge that these literary factors remain preeminent as ways of distinguishing between expanded editions of biblical books and new rewritten compositions, and analysis of compositional technique and exegetical purpose is of little help in this regard. On the other hand, perhaps analysis of a wider range of texts than has been possible here will provide new perspectives on the relationship between rewriting and textual status.

6.2.3 *A Continuum of Scriptural Reworking?*

The final question to be addressed is that of *quantity* vs. *quality* of rewriting: how does the idea of a ‘continuum’ of reworking help us to understand the various manifestations of the phenomenon of rewriting that we have considered here? Does quantity of rewriting have any connection to the status of a rewritten text as a copy of a biblical book or a new composition?

Before reflecting on the latter question, it is important to consider the degree to which the results of my study problematize the concept of a continuum in the first place. We have seen that reworking is not like filling a glass or painting a room, such that the amount of ‘reworked’ as opposed to ‘non-reworked’ text could easily be quantified. Instead, rewriting is a process that manifests itself in a variety of compositional techniques and that deposits in writing an even wider variety of exegetical concerns. While most people might agree intuitively that, for example, the Pentateuch is more heavily reworked in TS than in SP, in order for the idea of a continuum to have more than intuitive value it must be possible to quantify accurately the amount of reworking in various texts. Several factors militate against the practicality, if

not the possibility, of such quantification. First, given that the text to which changes were being made was constantly in flux in this period, how could we ever determine with the necessary precision what constitutes a change? Although in many cases the status of a variant as a deliberate change is clear, in many minor cases the more original reading cannot be determined. Second, even if it were possible to quantify precisely the number of words retained vs. words changed or added in a given rewritten text, how are changes like rearrangements counted? No words are necessarily removed or added, but certainly change has taken place. The problems only multiply: should additions from elsewhere be regarded as less significant than addition of brand-new material? What of changes that, though small in size, have major exegetical import? It seems wrong that the addition of the word שרתי in 4Q158 1–2 13, which reflects a substantive halakhic issue, should be given the same quantitative weight as the addition of a word, like שמה in 4Q158 1–2 3, that does not actually impact the meaning of the text and does not accomplish a clear exegetical goal. Yet how would the difference between these two examples be reflected quantitatively? My point is that the idea of a quantitative continuum breaks down in the face of the qualitative differences between various compositional techniques and between the various purposes to which they were put, as exemplified in this study. Careful study of individual rewritten texts indicates that the key features of each are the range of techniques they employ and the specific purposes for which they employ those techniques. A text's character is not captured simply by trying to determine 'how different' it is from its *Vorlage*—and indeed, such an attempt would likely be quick to founder.

If quantification is, on the one hand, inevitably inaccurate and, on the other hand, less than satisfactory in terms of what it tells us about each individual text, its potential to help us distinguish new rewritten compositions from copies of biblical texts seems all the more in jeopardy. If we cannot accurately plot where each text lies along a continuum, there is no way to draw a line at a given point on the continuum separating 'Bible' from 'not-Bible.' This is not to say that quantity plays no role: if, for example, a revision of the book of Genesis started with the creation of the world and the Garden of Eden but then followed the history of the snake as it crawled on its belly and begot its offspring in numerous generations, it would no longer be anything we would recognize as Genesis. (On the other hand, this would no longer be rewriting in any sustained sense, either.) It seems foolish

to deny that texts can base themselves on an earlier text, yet depart so drastically from it that they can no longer be considered the ‘same text.’¹³ Yet in order to advance the discussion, it seems most profitable to abandon the notion of a continuum of reworking and think instead about how exactly readers or hearers construe texts. How are differences between two texts perceived and evaluated? Faced with two texts that have many similarities but perhaps many differences, what are the conditions under which an audience will regard the two as versions of the same text as opposed to two different texts? Obviously these questions cannot be answered here, but the more nuanced picture of reworking that has resulted from this study suggests that it is time for us to stop thinking so much in terms of the *amount* of reworking in a given text and start looking for new conceptual tools that will provide new frameworks and vocabulary for discussing the various forms early Jewish scriptural rewriting could take.

6.2.4 *Looking Ahead*

The previous paragraph indicates that this study constitutes only one step in what must be a longer process of analysis of rewritten texts and reassessment of the terminology and categories we use to describe them. It is my hope that this investigation of the 4QRP mss will provide the impetus for similar work on other texts and a better understanding of the similarities and differences between the wide variety of rewritten texts known from Qumran and elsewhere. In closing, I will simply indicate two primary directions for such work that seem particularly important.

First, many rewritten texts remain in need of the type of detailed analysis used here, particularly from the perspective of compositional technique and exegetical goals. These texts include the Genesis Apocryphon, Jubilees, Josephus’s *Antiquities*, and others. The pentateuchal Targumim constitute a rich trove of rewriting that should also be brought into the discussion.¹⁴ Furthermore, a fuller analysis of exegetical variants identifiable in the biblical versions, such as that

¹³ This is patently the case with, e.g., 1 Enoch, which is at least partially inspired by aspects of the Primeval History in Genesis, but does not interact in any sustained way with the pentateuchal text.

¹⁴ See especially Samely, *Interpretation of Speech*. Although Samely does not relate his work explicitly to earlier forms of rewriting, a great deal of his analysis is relevant to the questions raised here.

programmatically begun by Andrew Teeter in his recent dissertation, is also necessary.¹⁵

Second, a key object of future study will be clarification of the place of rewritten texts from the Second Temple period in the history of Jewish thought. On the one hand, it should be determined if and exactly how rewriting from this period continues processes operative in earlier stages of the formation of the Pentateuch (e.g. Deuteronomy's reuse of the Covenant Code), which in turn can be traced back to scribal practices current in the ancient Near East at least as far back as the second millennium B.C.E.¹⁶ On the other hand, there should be continued study of the ways in which pentateuchal reworking anticipates the work of the rabbis, especially as regards attitudes towards the scriptural text and exegetical method.¹⁷

Ultimately, the importance of understanding rewritten texts lies in their prevalence as a mode of interpretation in the late Second Temple period. Both revised versions of biblical books and new compositions of the sort we have labeled 'rewritten Scripture' attest to a remarkable period in the history of exegesis. At this time, notions of the sanctity, antiquity, and divine origins of the text were well-developed. Yet this did not translate into the inviolability of the text or the cessation of

¹⁵ Teeter, "Exegesis."

¹⁶ On rewriting within the pentateuchal legal corpora, see Levinson, *Deuteronomy*; Jeffrey Stackert, *Rewriting the Torah: Literary Revision in Deuteronomy and the Holiness Legislation* (FAT 52; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007). On the connections between the scribal practices of ancient Israel and those of its ancient Near Eastern neighbors, see e.g. Jeffrey H. Tigay, "The Evolution of the Pentateuchal Narratives in the Light of the Evolution of the *Gilgamesh Epic*," in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (ed. Jeffrey H. Tigay; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), 21–52; David M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005). For consideration of inner-biblical reuse in light of rewriting in late Second Temple period texts, see Levinson, "Revelation of Redaction"; Carr, "Method"; Molly M. Zahn, "Reexamining Empirical Models: The Case of Exodus 13," in *Das Deuteronomium zwischen Pentateuch und deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk* (ed. Eckart Otto and Reinhard Achenbach; FRLANT 206; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 36–55.

¹⁷ Besides the work of Samely on the Pentateuch Targums, mentioned above, the work of Steven Fraade and Azzan Yadin on the connections between rabbinic modes of thought and those prevalent at Qumran offer a starting point for explorations of this type. See e.g. Steven D. Fraade, "Interpretive Authority in the Studying Community at Qumran," *JJS* 44 (1993): 46–69; idem, "Looking for Legal Midrash at Qumran," in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Michael E. Stone and Esther G. Chazon; STDJ 28; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 59–79; Azzan Yadin, "4QMMT, Rabbi Ishmael, and the Origins of Legal Midrash," *DSD* 10 (2003): 130–49.

access to traditional loci of revelation like Mount Sinai. The relationship between sacred text and faithful reader was different from what it would become in later Judaism and Christianity. In this setting, the faithful transmitter of the ancient and sacred textual tradition could, at the same time, be an innovator, whose own faithfulness to that textual tradition demanded reshaping of it.