

Talking about Rewritten Texts: Some Reflections on Terminology*

Molly M. Zahn—

Names are not just names; they are not simply convenient labels that we stick on the front of semantic shoeboxes to indicate the contents inside. On the one hand, names and categories are manifestations of our worldviews, reflecting conscious and subconscious aspects of language, culture, and circumstance. On the other hand, and perhaps less obviously, names and categories affect how we think; they actually influence the ways in which we understand the things denoted by those labels. Once an object or phenomenon is given a particular name or placed in a particular category, we approach that object or phenomenon with specific expectations in mind regarding what sort of thing it is.¹

The intense debates in recent years regarding the proper terminology for various types of Second Temple Jewish texts highlight this connection between the names we give things and the ways we think about those things. The manuscripts discovered at Qumran include a wide variety of previously unknown texts with some sort of link to the collection that we now know as the Hebrew Bible. As a result of the publication and study of these texts, a new model for understanding

* I would like to thank the editors for their invitation to contribute to this volume. I am also especially grateful to Hanne von Weissenberg for her astute comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

1 Hence, for example, the feminist critique of the use of exclusively male language to talk about God: despite insistence in the theological tradition that God transcends human understanding and human categories, constant and exclusive reference to God as male limits the imagination and reinforces the idea that God really *is*, in some way, male. See the seminal work of Rosemary Radford Ruether, *Sexism and God-Talk* (Boston: Beacon, 1983), 47–71. By happy coincidence, as I was revising this essay an article appeared in the *New York Times Magazine* on the influence of language upon the way we experience the world: Guy Deutscher, “Does Your Language Shape How You Think?,” *New York Times Magazine*, 29 August 2010. Cited 27 August 2010. Online: <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/29/magazine/29language-t.html?src=me&ref=homepage>.

the production, transmission, and interpretation of authoritative literature in Second Temple Judaism is slowly emerging. Although the particulars of these processes are still debated, at the heart of this new model stand observations about the pluriformity of scriptural texts, the active role of successive scribes in shaping the texts they copied, and the lack of a fixed canon of scripture.² While our views about the nature of “scripture” in the Second Temple period have changed, however, the labels we use to describe the textual phenomena of this period have been slow to catch up. Terms like “parabiblical,” “apocryphal,” “pseudo-X,” and even “Bible” and “biblical” imply an older model in which it was generally assumed that most of the canon of Hebrew Scripture, especially the Torah, was fixed prior to the late Second Temple period, and that the Masoretic Text (MT) for the most part constituted the earliest and most authoritative witness to this canon.³ As a new approach rooted in textual pluriformity and the lack of a fixed canon has developed, the inadequacy of these labels has been noted with increasing frequency. By the same token, the argument has begun to be made that use of these terms has in fact hindered full appreciation of what the Qumran materials are telling us. Just as a lifetime imagining God as male can make it difficult even for those who might wish to use feminine imagery for God, the very use of outdated terms in the study of Second Temple Judaism works to perpetuate the assumption of the centrality of the MT and the hegemony of an MT-like canon, even as scholars attempt to articulate the fact that the reality appears to have been quite the opposite.⁴

-
- 2 For a good recent overview of these issues, see Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 1–15.
 - 3 On this older model and its breakdown, see especially Eugene C. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999); Eugene Ulrich, “The Notion and Definition of Canon,” in *The Canon Debate* (ed. Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 21–35. John Barton’s somewhat older discussion of the evidence (or lack thereof) for the fixing of various parts of the Hebrew canon remains very useful; see John Barton, *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile* (2nd ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).
 - 4 See Eugene Ulrich, “Methodological Reflections on Determining Scriptural Status in First Century Judaism,” in *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods* (ed. Maxine L. Grossman; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 145–61. (I am grateful to Prof. Ulrich for sharing a copy of his article with me prior to publication.) Robert Kraft makes a similar point by referring to the “tyranny of canonical assumptions,” which he defines as “the temptation to impose on those ancients whom we study our modern ideas about what constituted ‘scripture’ and how it was viewed.” See Robert A. Kraft, “Para-mania: Beside, Before and Beyond Bible Studies,” *JBL* 126 (2007): 5–27 (at p. 17).

Thus, the search for appropriate terminology to describe the textual phenomena of Second Temple Judaism plays a key role in the ongoing attempt to better understand this material. Yet little consensus has been reached regarding new labels and categories, and often critiques of older terms obscure or confuse important issues at the same time as they valuably clarify others. In particular, it seems that confusion often arises regarding the interaction between *literary* issues—that is, how a given text relates to an earlier text in compositional terms—and issues of *authority*—that is, what kind of authoritative status is claimed by or attributed to a given text. This essay will engage the continuing debates over terminology with special attention to this distinction between literary issues and questions of authority. The result, I hope, will be an additional step towards a way of talking about scripture and interpretation in the Second Temple period—and thus of *thinking* about these issues—that better reflects the data.

1. “Bible” vs. “Scripture” and the Issue of Authoritative Status

In current debates about terminology and labels, one point on which there has been wide agreement is the unsuitability of the terms “Bible” or “biblical” with regard to any aspect of Second Temple Jewish literature.⁵ The words “Bible” and “biblical” imply the existence of some-

5 See especially James C. VanderKam, “The Wording of Biblical Citations in Some Rewritten Scriptural Works,” in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (ed. Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov; London: British Library, 2002), 41–56, at p. 52; also e.g. Ulrich, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 19; Sidnie White Crawford, “The ‘Rewritten’ Bible at Qumran: A Look at Three Texts,” *Erlsr* 26 (1999): 1–8 [Eng.] (at p. 1); Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 6; George J. Brooke, “The Rewritten Law, Prophets and Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible,” in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (ed. Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov; London: British Library, 2002), 31–40 (at p. 31); Bruno Chiesa, “Biblical and Parabiblical Texts from Qumran,” *Heno* 20 (1998): 131–51 (at pp. 132–33); Jonathan G. Campbell, “‘Rewritten Bible’ and ‘Parabiblical Texts’: A Terminological and Methodological Critique,” in *New Directions in Qumran Studies* (ed. Jonathan G. Campbell, William John Lyons, and Lloyd K. Pietersen; LSTS 52; London: T & T Clark, 2005), 43–68 (at p. 49); Anders Klostergaard Petersen, “Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon—Genre, Textual Strategy, or Canonical Anachronism,” in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech, and Eibert Tigchelaar; JSJSup 122; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 285–306 (at pp. 286–87); Kraft, “Para-mania,” 10–18. Objection to this trend is voiced by Moshe J. Bernstein, “What Has Happened to the Laws? The Treatment of Legal Material in 4QReworked Pentateuch,” *DSD* 15 (2008): 24–49

thing that could reasonably be called a Bible—a fixed collection including specific forms of certain texts regarded as sacred and authoritative—and there is simply no evidence that such a thing existed in the Second Temple period.⁶ Not only did the books that later ended up in the Hebrew Bible circulate in a variety of apparently equally authoritative forms, but numerous texts that did not ultimately make it into the Hebrew Bible seem to have claimed, and/or to have been regarded as possessing, at least the same level of authority and sanctity as those that did.⁷ Speaking of “Bible” or “biblical” for the Second Temple period gives the false impression that only the books of the Bible, and only the familiar (= MT) form of those books, were regarded as sacred.⁸

Numerous scholars, therefore, have proposed to replace “Bible” and “biblical” with the terms “scripture” and “scriptural.”⁹ This designation has the advantage of mirroring more closely the use in Second Temple texts of variations of the Hebrew root כתב.¹⁰ It also replaces a

(at p. 26). Bernstein acknowledges that the “spectrum of ‘biblical texts’” may have been broader for some in the Second Temple period than for others, but argues that there must have been a point, even if different for different individuals, “beyond which texts were not acknowledged or claimed to be ‘biblical.’” I agree with Bernstein in principle that various individuals or groups must have recognized certain texts as sacred and authoritative and denied that status to other texts. I would argue, however, that, insofar as the texts considered sacred may not have corresponded to those texts that ended up in the Hebrew Bible, it would be clearer to talk about the same phenomenon in terms of scriptural vs. nonscriptural texts. (On this distinction, see further below.)

- 6 Kraft makes the point that it is really not until the development of “mega-codices” in the fourth century CE that “the Bible” in our modern sense of the term—a collection of sacred texts contained between two covers—came into existence (“Para-mania,” 10). Although of course it is possible to conceive of a “canon” in the form of a fixed list of sacred books (or a fixed number of cubbyholes containing a fixed collection of scrolls), Kraft notes that “even if one has some sort of list, there is lots of room for loose edges,” and the texts of the period tend to mention categories like “law” and “prophets,” without delineating the precise contents of these categories (“Para-mania,” 16).
- 7 On textual pluriformity, see Ulrich, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 17–33, 79–120, and most recently “Methodological Reflections,” 152. On the scriptural status of books other than those of the Hebrew Bible, see James C. VanderKam, “Authoritative Literature in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *DSD* 5 (1998): 382–402; Armin Lange, “The Status of the Biblical Texts in the Qumran Corpus and the Canonical Process,” in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (ed. Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov; London: British Library, 2002), 21–30 (at pp. 23–24).
- 8 See Ulrich, “Methodological Reflections,” 152.
- 9 This suggestion is nearly universal among the scholars cited in n. 6 above.
- 10 James C. VanderKam and Peter W. Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: T & T Clark, 2005), 156.

term that has a concrete, specific referent (“The Bible” = a specific collection of books)¹¹ with one that is more open-ended. To be sure, in everyday usage “Scripture” or “the Scriptures” is generally used as a synonym for the Bible in the sense of a fixed collection.¹² In the context of the academic study of religions, however, “scripture” or “scriptures” (and here the lower-case is probably important) can also refer more generally to any text or group of texts considered sacred and authoritative by a particular religious tradition.¹³ Thus, the “scripture” of any given subset of Second Temple Judaism properly includes all the texts considered sacred by that group, whether or not they later came to be part of “the Bible.”¹⁴

I fully support the use of “scripture/scriptural” instead of “Bible/biblical” in discussions of the sacred literature of the Second Temple period. We must, however, be completely cognizant of the considerable ramifications of this switch, especially when it comes to talking about the many texts from this period that relate in some way to what we know as biblical books. There are two major issues, one of which has to do with the difficulty of determining what was “scriptural” in the Second Temple period, and the other of which pertains to the interplay between literary issues and issues of authority that I mentioned above.

The first issue, the difficulty of determining what was considered scriptural in Second Temple Judaism, is complicated by the religious and political diversity of the period and the paucity of our information about how texts were regarded by a given group. Most frequently,

11 This despite disagreements between various Christian denominations regarding which books in fact belong in “The Bible.”

12 See e.g. the *Oxford English Dictionary* / s.v. “scripture” / where the first five definitions given equate it with the Bible in one way or another.

13 For consideration of scripture in a context broader than Judaism and Christianity, see William A. Graham, “Scripture,” in *The Encyclopedia of Religion* (ed. Mircea Eliade et al.; 16 vols.; New York: Macmillan, 1987), 13:133–145; Wilfred Cantwell Smith, *What is Scripture? A Comparative Approach* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993). For a similar definition, see also Petersen, “Rewritten Bible,” 287.

14 Formulating the matter in this way raises the question of how precisely we determine whether a given book was regarded as “sacred” (and by whom), as well as the related question of whether some books, even perhaps books that later ended up in the Hebrew Bible, were perhaps regarded as authoritative or important but were not viewed as sacred. As indicated below, more reflection is needed on our ability to distinguish between various levels of authority or sacredness attributed to texts in the late Second Temple period. This is a problem that affects not just the study of early Judaism but the study of the role of scripture in the world’s religions more broadly; see William A. Graham, *Beyond the Written Word: Oral Aspects of Scripture in the History of Religion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 4–5.

questions about what constituted scripture in this period or within the Qumran community have been answered by noting the number of copies of a particular book preserved at Qumran and the number of times that work is formally cited, alluded to, or otherwise reused.¹⁵ This gives us a basic idea of what the Qumranites considered particularly important, but leaves numerous questions unanswered. For instance, would the Qumranites have actually denied authoritative or scriptural status to texts that were not frequently quoted or not preserved in great numbers, or did they simply, like so many other Jews and Christians throughout history, have a “canon within a canon,” as Treballe Barrera puts it; a subset of scriptural writings that they considered particularly significant?¹⁶ Should a distinction be made between “scriptural” and “authoritative” texts and, if so, how should this distinction be articulated?¹⁷ Does quotation of, allusion to, or rewriting of a particular text

-
- 15 See especially VanderKam, “Authoritative Literature,” and Lange, “Status of the Biblical Texts”; also Timothy H. Lim, “Authoritative Scriptures and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 303–22 (at pp. 307–18). (I am grateful to Prof. Lim for sharing a copy of his article with me prior to publication.)
- 16 Treballe Barrera argues that, at Qumran, among the earliest Christians, and elsewhere in Second Temple Judaism, the Torah, Isaiah, the Twelve, and Psalms “enjoyed a special authority” and were transmitted, commented upon, and used in a different manner from the historical books, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel. While he implies that this second group was somehow less authoritative than the first, Treballe-Barrera seems to agree that the second group was also seen as scriptural; that is, as his title indicates, we are dealing with a “canon within a canon.” See Julio Treballe Barrera, “A ‘Canon within a Canon’: Two Series of Old Testament Books Differently Transmitted, Interpreted and Authorized,” *RevQ* 19 (2000): 383–99. It is of course unclear whether “canon,” with its implications of fixed boundaries, is an appropriate term for what appears to have been an open or fluid collection of scriptural works in the Second Temple period; Eugene Ulrich has argued forcefully that “talk of an open canon is confusing and counterproductive” (“Notion and Definition of Canon,” 34). For a different view, see Lim, “Authoritative Scriptures,” 303–5.
- 17 Most obviously, “scriptural” texts could be defined as those considered sacred, while “authoritative” texts would be of normative importance within a given community, yet not considered sacred. Even so defined, however, the two categories are difficult to separate. One option would be to argue that, to be regarded as scripture in the Second Temple period, a text must have been viewed as originating in Israel’s ancient past; see Barton, *Oracles of God*, 59–62. This approach is followed by Campbell, “Rewritten Bible,” 66. Yet the neatness of this division is complicated by the possibility that some purportedly “ancient” works (like Qoheleth or Ruth) were not accepted as scriptural by all Jewish groups (see e.g. the argument of Lange, “Status of the Biblical Texts,” 24, that those two works were among those not considered authoritative by the Qumranites). Furthermore, how should works such as the pesharim be viewed, which as the products of divinely-inspired exegesis may have had a

automatically mark that text as scriptural, or could other texts, viewed as important or authoritative but perhaps not as scripture, be subject to the same procedures?¹⁸ Finally, we must always remember to ask “authoritative/scriptural” *for whom?*¹⁹ Although certain texts or traditions may have been of secondary importance for the Qumran community, they may have been more significant for other Second Temple groups.²⁰ Insofar as the Qumran caves preserve compositions that appear to have been brought to Qumran from elsewhere, we may find in them traces of different views regarding which texts were especially sacred/authoritative.²¹ All of these questions deserve much more attention than I can give them here. My purpose in raising them is primarily to stress the difficulty in determining just what was considered authoritative for a given Second Temple group, and in delineating possible distinctions between “scriptural” and merely “authoritative” texts.

The difficulty of deciding what exactly was “scripture” should warn us of possible danger when we seek to replace “Bible/biblical” with “scripture/scriptural,” and even more so with regard to possible replacements for derivative terms like “Rewritten Bible” and “parabiblical.” The danger lies in the fact that, while scholars have often simply substituted “scriptural” for “biblical” and continued to go on talking about the 24 books that in fact ended up in the Hebrew Bible (plus a very few others), “Bible” and “scripture” do not actually refer to the same thing. What is more, they do not even refer to the same *type of*

similar claim to authority as scriptural works in a community which viewed revelation as ongoing? See Lim, “Authoritative Literature,” 306.

- 18 As Brooke notes, the fact that a text was revised, expanded, supplemented, or otherwise rewritten is a testimony to the importance of that text for the rewriter: if a text was not important, why bother to interpret, rewrite, or elaborate upon it? See George Brooke, “Between Authority and Canon: The Significance of Reworking the Bible for Understanding the Canonical Process,” in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran* (ed. Esther Chazon et al.; STDJ 58; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 85–104 (at p. 98). Yet the exact nature of this importance is unclear. Do we know, for instance, that the authors of Chronicles viewed their source text, the Deuteronomistic History, as *scriptural*, as opposed to merely authoritative or even simply a significant source for the history they wished to rewrite? (I thank Hanne von Weissenberg for this point.)
- 19 As Lim reminds us; “Authoritative Literature,” 307.
- 20 Note for example Brooke’s observation that the apparent lack of interest in the books of Chronicles at Qumran points to a deliberate choice on the part of the community, in response to the promotion of Chronicles by the Hasmoneans: George J. Brooke, “The Books of Chronicles and the Scrolls from Qumran,” in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld* (ed. Robert Rezetko, Timothy H. Lim, and W. Brian Aucker; VTSup 113; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 35–48.
- 21 As Lim, quoting van der Woude, notes, texts in one’s library do not necessarily reflect the owner’s own beliefs; “Authoritative Scripture,” 306.

thing. This is the second issue mentioned above, the one pertaining to the distinction between literary issues and issues of authority. The Bible, despite some persistent fuzziness around the edges is first and foremost a collection of specific literary works: Genesis, Exodus, Isaiah, etc. Thus, when we speak of biblical texts at Qumran, the generally accepted meaning is manuscript copies of books that now appear in the Hebrew Bible.²² On the other hand, calling a text “scripture” (as long as “scripture” is not being used as a synonym for the Bible but in the broader sense outlined above) says nothing about that text’s literary identity or membership in any specific corpus. The books of the Bible are scripture, but so are the Qur’an and the Lotus Sutra. What calling something scripture *does* say is that that text is or was (as best we can determine) regarded as sacred by some group of people at some point in time. In other words, referring to something as *biblical* implies a *literary* correspondence to some text included in the Bible, while referring to something as *scriptural* implies that it is or was once seen as sacred and authoritative, but says nothing about its literary character or contents.²³

Full appreciation of this distinction is critical to a proper understanding of the numerous texts from Qumran that show some connection to the texts of the Hebrew Bible. It seems clear that all of those texts, whether they are labeled “Rewritten Bible/Scripture,” a “parabiblical” text, an “apocryphon,” a “pseudo-X” text, or even a copy of a given biblical book, are classified in this way because of *literary* judgments made by early editors or subsequent scholars. Various textual features, such as the appearance of certain characters that also appear in a biblical book, the inclusion of certain content that parallels a biblical book, or similarity to the style and vocabulary of a certain biblical book, led (naturally enough) to the hypothesis of some sort of relationship between a given biblical book and the previously unknown work in question. The nature of that relationship, of course, can be variously construed: does the Qumran text represent a reworking of the biblical book, constitute a source for the biblical book, or simply play off a cha-

22 This usage has certainly been influenced heavily by the editorial principles of the DJD series, in which only compositions included in the Hebrew Bible are classified as “biblical.” This means that even books that do appear in some Bibles, such as Tobit and Ben Sira, are classified as “extrabiblical.” See further Ulrich, “Methodological Reflections,” 154.

23 Of course, calling something biblical also tends to imply the scriptural status of that text, insofar as the texts in the Bible ultimately ended up there because the communities of Jews and Christians who established the biblical canons decided they belonged on finite lists of those communities’ sacred texts.

racter or episode in a biblical book but go in a different direction? But all of these questions involve investigation of the *literary* relationship between two texts. In other words, the reason we are spending so much time talking about “parabiblical texts,” “Rewritten Bible,” and the like is that a great number of texts from Qumran appear to have some sort of literary relationship to one or more of the books that ended up in the Hebrew Bible.

Because the classification and description of these texts is rooted in literary analysis, issues of sanctity and authority that inhere in the label “scripture” are not, in the first instance, even relevant. Although the fact that a work was rewritten, expanded, or elaborated upon probably indicates that the author and/or the author’s community believed that work to possess some sort of particular importance,²⁴ these various processes of textual extension say nothing about the status of the new text thereby produced. It has often been assumed—sometimes explicitly and more often, I think, tacitly—that rewritten or parabiblical texts did not have the status of scripture, as if the very fact of being derived from a biblical book precluded a work from being seen as sacred or authoritative.²⁵ Yet there is a great deal of evidence that works belonging to these categories not only claimed but were in fact granted scriptural status. Two works that many would classify as “Rewritten Scripture,” Deuteronomy and Chronicles, themselves became part of the traditional Hebrew canon.²⁶ Jubilees and 1 Enoch seem to have been regarded as scriptural at Qumran, and both were included in the Ethi-

24 See above, n. 19.

25 For explicit recognition of the assumption involved, see the following statement by Emanuel Tov regarding reworked compositions, including 4QReworked Pentateuch, the Temple Scroll, and 4Q252: “These documents were not considered to reflect an authoritative text, although this assumption cannot really be proven. The rewritten biblical texts should be regarded, in a way, as literary exercises”; Tov, “Biblical Texts as Reworked in Some Qumran Manuscripts with Special Attention to 4QRP and 4QParaGen-Exod,” in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant* (ed. Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 111–34 (at p. 114).

26 Of course this does not mean that Deuteronomy and Chronicles would have been regarded in the same way by any given group in the Second Temple period. At Qumran, for instance, Deuteronomy seems to have been extremely popular, while Chronicles appears to have been avoided (see n. 21 above). For Deuteronomy and Chronicles as Rewritten Scripture, see e.g. C. T. R. Hayward, “Rewritten Bible,” in *A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (ed. R. J. Coggins and J. L. Houlden; London: SCM, 1990), 595–98, at p. 596; George J. Brooke, “Rewritten Bible,” in *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 777–81 (at p. 778).

opic canon.²⁷ The Temple Scroll's self-presentation as direct divine revelation to Moses on Sinai certainly constitutes a bid for scriptural status, though it is difficult to know how widely its claim was accepted.²⁸ On the other hand, we have no evidence for the authoritative or scriptural status of rewritten texts like the Genesis Apocryphon. It follows that the question of a given work's *literary* connection with a book of the Bible must be asked, and answered, independently of questions about that work's *authoritative status* or lack thereof.²⁹ Texts with connections to biblical books may or may not have themselves been regarded as scriptural.³⁰

This I hope clarifies why I am concerned that the full implications of a switch from "Bible/biblical" to "scripture/scriptural" be recognized. Asking whether a text is "biblical" (or asking about a text's relationship to a book of the Bible) is a very different question from asking whether a text is "scriptural": the former addresses a fundamentally literary issue; the latter an issue of status, either intended or received. As a result, when it comes to talking about works related to biblical texts, we cannot simply substitute "scriptural" for "biblical" without further reflection on the changes in meaning that might result. We furthermore cannot assume that, just because a work is deemed "nonbib-

27 VanderKam, "Authoritative Literature," 396–400.

28 On this issue, with literature, see my essay "New Voices, Ancient Words: The Temple Scroll's Reuse of the Bible," in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel* (ed. John Day; LHB/OTS 422; London: T & T Clark, 2005), 435–58 (at pp. 436–41).

29 It is my sense that this issue has not been given sufficient attention, though the point has been made by both Bernstein ("Whether the later work might also have some significant ('biblical,' 'canonical') status does not at all affect its classification as 'rewritten Bible'") and Brooke ("But it is also important to remember that to identify a text as modeled on another has little to do with a clear assertion of whether or not it was deemed to be authoritative..."); see Moshe J. Bernstein, "'Rewritten Bible': A Generic Category Which Has Outlived its Usefulness?," *Textus* 22 (2005): 169–96 (at p. 172 n. 3); George J. Brooke, "From Bible to Midrash: Approaches to Biblical Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls by Modern Interpreters," in *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003–2006* (ed. Anders Klostergaard Petersen et al.; STDJ 80; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 1–19 (at p. 6).

30 It remains to be determined whether and to what extent interaction with earlier scriptural texts actually functioned to authorize these compositions, as has been suggested in different ways by Bernard M. Levinson, *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 14–17; Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (JSJSup 77; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 16, 46; and Bernard M. Levinson and Molly M. Zahn, "Revelation Regained: The Hermeneutics of י and מ in the Temple Scroll," *DSD* 9 (2002): 295–346 (at p. 308). In any case, it seems clear that the literary fact of having been derived from or based on an earlier authoritative text did not disqualify a text from itself being seen as authoritative: if anything, the opposite was the case!

lical," it is also "nonscriptural" in the sense that it was not regarded as sacred and authoritative. This conclusion bears on recent discussions of the relative merits of several other terms, to which I now turn.

2. Parabiblical/Parascriptural

The term "parabiblical" has become especially prominent in discussions of Second Temple literature, likely because of its use as one of several broad categories used to classify Qumran manuscripts in the DJD series. As Tov remarks in the Foreword to DJD 13, "[t]he volumes of the parabiblical texts contain various compositions which have in common that they are closely related to texts or themes of the Hebrew Bible."³¹ Tov further notes that the texts designated "parabiblical" vary in their degree of closeness to the biblical text. Indeed, "parabiblical" has tended to serve as a sort of catch-all term for texts related more or less loosely to one or more books that now are part of the Hebrew Bible—texts that may then have been more narrowly designated as "Rewritten Bible," "apocryphon of" or "pseudo"-X, etc.

Of course the difficulty with the term "parabiblical" is the same as that facing the terms "Bible" and "biblical": if there was no Bible, no fixed canon, in the Second Temple period, how can we then label something "parabiblical"?³² The term implies that texts to which it is applied existed "beside" or "beyond" biblical literature, but (so the argument goes) there was no such thing as biblical literature at the time these texts were produced.³³ Jonathan Campbell and Robert Kraft have both, therefore, suggested the term "parascriptural" in place of "parabiblical."³⁴

While Kraft seems to suggest that "parascriptural" functions basically as a synonym of "parabiblical" while avoiding the problem of

31 Emanuel Tov, Introduction to *Qumran Cave 4.VIII, Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (ed. H. Attridge et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam; DJD 13; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), ix.

32 This objection to "parabiblical" is voiced most strongly by Chiesa, "Biblical and Parabiblical Texts," 132–33; Campbell, "Rewritten Bible," 51; Kraft, "Para-mania," 10–18.

33 For a playful but substantive discussion of the various meanings implied by the prefix *para-*, see Kraft, "Para-mania," 8–9.

34 Campbell, "Rewritten Bible," 51, 66; Kraft, "Para-Mania," 9, 27. "Parascriptural" is also employed by Daniel K. Falk; for his rationale, see Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures among the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: T & T Clark, 2007), 17.

anachronism, Campbell makes the point that “parascriptural” is not an appropriate designation for every text currently classified as “parabiblical.” The issue is that, in order to classify something as “para-” X, we must decide that the thing in question is not itself X.³⁵ That is, if “parabiblical” compositions are given that label because they are not themselves biblical but are judged to have some connection to a biblical book, then “parascriptural” texts would be those that have something to do with scripture or a given scriptural text, but are not themselves scriptural. Since a certain level of authority is inherent in the term “scripture,” the shift from “parabiblical” to “parascriptural” introduces the issue of status into what had previously been essentially a literary judgment. As I argued above, it seems clear that the primary factors that lead to categorization of a text as “parabiblical” are *literary* factors; a text is called “parabiblical” because it is seen as relating in some way to the content, themes, or characters of a given biblical book. In an older model in which it was assumed that the canon was essentially fixed in the Second Temple period, it would have been assumed that no non-biblical text would have been viewed as scripture. Thus, the literary judgment would almost automatically have involved a judgment about status as well. In the current situation, though, in which the scriptural status of at least some nonbiblical books is widely acknowledged, calling something (e.g. Jubilees) “parabiblical” does not automatically preclude the recognition that that work might have been considered scriptural in the Second Temple period (as was likely the case for Jubilees). On the other hand, if we label a work “parascriptural,” we are making an a priori judgment that that work was not considered scriptural. Yet, as Campbell notes, numerous “parabiblical” texts (such as Jubilees) *were* clearly considered *scriptural* in the Second Temple period.³⁶

In the end, we cannot simply replace “parabiblical” with “parascriptural” without substantially redefining the contents of the category. Though “parabiblical” has been used to describe texts with some (literary) relation to one or more texts that ended up in the Hebrew Bible, “parascriptural” most properly designate works having something to do with sacred and authoritative texts, but which were not

35 Campbell, “Rewritten Bible,” 51: “[the term] ‘Parascriptural Texts’ withholds scriptural status from the compositions concerned as much as ‘Parabiblical Texts’ withholds canonical status.”

36 “Rewritten Bible,” 52–53.

themselves regarded as sacred.³⁷ Furthermore, the term would not necessarily imply anything about a text's *literary* relationship to "scriptural" texts, but only that this particular composition did not have that scriptural status.³⁸ Thus, if we are looking for terms to describe texts that rework, revise, or re-edit earlier scriptural texts, "parascriptural" does not seem suitable. On the other hand, "parabiblical," though it does involve an anachronism and should be avoided for that reason, in fact makes some sense as a descriptor of a literary relationship between two texts—one that has come to be in our Bibles and one that has not. In the conclusion, I will build on this literary aspect to suggest a possible productive use, not of "parabiblical" itself, but of the "para-" prefix more generally.

3. Apocryphon

While "the Apocrypha" (plural) refers to a specific list of books considered part of the canon by some Christian churches but not included in the Tanakh and Protestant Old Testaments, the label "apocryphon of X" has frequently been employed to designate various previously unknown compositions found at Qumran that exhibit some kind of relationship to a text or character known to us from the Hebrew Bible.³⁹ We thus have compositions known as the Genesis Apocryphon, Apocryphon of Moses, Apocryphon of Joshua, Apocryphon of Jeremiah, Pentateuch Apocryphon, Apocryphon of Samuel–Kings, Apocryphon of Lamentations, and so on. Nothing more seems to be meant by the term "apocryphon" than a designation of the non-biblical character of the work and some sort of relationship to a biblical text.⁴⁰ But as Bernstein

37 Campbell in fact suggests the term "Parascriptural" for a group of Second Temple works that he judges likely to have been authoritative but not scriptural, including Ben Sira, 1–4 Maccabees, and Qumran sectarian literature ("Rewritten Bible," 66).

38 I suppose it might be possible to use "parascriptural" to designate works that have a literary relationship to some scriptural book *but* were not themselves considered scriptural—but to me this seems only to confuse the issue further by requiring judgment *both* about the literary nature of a text *and* about its scriptural status or lack thereof.

39 For discussion of the terminological issues here, see Moshe J. Bernstein, "Pseudepigraphy in the Qumran Scrolls: Categories and Functions," in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Esther G. Chazon and Michael E. Stone; STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 1–26 (at pp. 1–3); Campbell, "Rewritten Bible," 53–55.

40 Sometimes these labels, especially those given to texts published early on, seem to defy logic. For example, 1Q25 and 2Q23 are called "1QApocryphal Prophecy" and

and Campbell have pointed out, the very term “apocryphon of” requires a fixed canon; as Bernstein puts it, “[t]he term ‘apocryphal’ should, *prima facie*, denote a relationship to a body of material which is canonical or non-apocryphal from the standpoint of the author or audience, but this is not always the case.”⁴¹ If there was no such fixed canon, no “non-apocryphal” material, in the late Second Temple period—and it is precisely this idea of a fixed canon that we are working so hard to avoid—then it makes no sense to speak of texts from this period as apocryphal. At the very least, the historically pejorative usage of the terms Apocrypha and apocryphal strongly implies that, if X represents a recognized scriptural work, an “Apocryphon of X” lacks this scriptural status.⁴² Again a label that seems primarily intended to capture a *literary* or *conceptual* relationship carries along with it inappropriate baggage pertaining to questions of authority and status, implying not only that “Apocryphon of X” is related to scriptural text X in some way, but also that it could not have had X’s scriptural status.⁴³ As Bernstein and Campbell note, this term is best not applied to Second Temple compositions.

4. Pseudepigrapha, Pseudepigraphy, Pseudo-X

“Pseudepigraphy,” on the face of it, has a straightforward definition: it is the practice of composing a text and then attributing that text to someone else; in the Second Temple context this was usually a heroic figure of the ancient past.⁴⁴ The Pseudepigrapha, on the other hand, is the label given to an amorphous body of (actually or purportedly) Jewish texts, (mostly) dating from the Second Temple period, preserved in Greek or translations from the Greek, and not included in the main

“2QApocryphal Prophecy,” respectively. One wonders why they were not simply called “1Q/2QProphecy,” for if these texts matched any prophecies found in biblical books, they surely would have been categorized as biblical texts. Even more curiously, 4Q488, which contains just one legible word, is labeled 4Qpap Apocryphon ar.

41 Bernstein, “Pseudepigraphy,” 3.

42 As Campbell notes (“Rewritten Bible,” 53–54), the Church Father Jerome deliberately used the label “Apocrypha” for the specific group of works absent from the Hebrew Bible but part of the Christian Old Testament, in the hopes that they would be declared non-canonical as a result.

43 See Campbell, “Rewritten Bible,” 55.

44 See Bernstein, “Pseudepigraphy,” 1.

Jewish or Christian canons of Scripture.⁴⁵ Although the term *pseudepigrapha* most naturally designates works attributed to people other than their real author—that is, actual *pseudepigraphs*—it is often used in a looser sense, and numerous compositions that are not actually *pseudepigraphic* in the technical sense of the term are often included among “The *Pseudepigrapha*.”⁴⁶ VanderKam and Flint have attempted to redeploy the term *Pseudepigrapha* to apply to works that are properly *pseudepigraphs* in the sense of being falsely attributed, and they include many previously unknown *pseudepigraphic* Qumran texts under the label “New *Pseudepigrapha*.”⁴⁷ If this redeployment could be so complete that the traditional meaning was totally obscured, “*pseudepigrapha*” would be a helpful classificatory term. In common usage, however, works are classified as part of the “*Pseudepigrapha*,” just as was the case with the “*Apocrypha*,” because they did not end up in later scriptural canons; that is, their non-biblical nature, not their literary nature as *pseudepigraphs*, is what makes them part of the *Pseudepigrapha*.⁴⁸ We are back to our familiar problem: many works that are *pseudepigraphic* in form, such as *Jubilees*, *1 Enoch*, *Daniel*, and *Deuteronomy*, were clearly regarded as scriptural in the late Second Temple period (and did enter later Jewish and/or Christian canons). As long as “*Pseudepigrapha*” continues to be used to refer to a loose collection of noncanonical literature, it seems counterproductive to try to redefine it as referring strictly to true *pseudepigraphs*. On the other hand, perhaps removing the initial capital letter and anglicizing the plural form is all that is necessary to recover this term: *pseudepigraphs* are works attributed to someone other than their actual author, and are not necessarily to be connected with the collection known as *The Pseudepigrapha*.

The term “*pseudepigraphy*” itself is somewhat less problematic as long as it is regarded strictly as a compositional technique that manifests itself in the content, style, and literary voice of a work.⁴⁹ Although *pseudepigraphic* attribution is generally regarded as a claim to authori-

45 For an attempt at a clear definition of the term and the corpus designated by it, see Michael E. Stone, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the *Pseudepigrapha*,” *DSD* 3 (1996): 270–95 (at pp. 270–71).

46 See Bernstein, “*Pseudepigraphy*,” 2; Campbell, “*Rewritten Bible*,” 55–56. Stone notes that, in contrast to the *Apocrypha*, there is no fixed list of texts belonging to the *Pseudepigrapha*, such that the various modern collections of the *Pseudepigrapha* vary somewhat in their content (“*Dead Sea Scrolls and the Pseudepigrapha*,” 271).

47 VanderKam and Flint, *Meaning of the DSS*, 203.

48 Bernstein, “*Pseudepigraphy*,” 1–3.

49 For the various types of *pseudepigraphy* attested at Qumran, see Bernstein, “*Pseudepigraphy*,” 25–26.

ty, once again it is best to keep issues of status separate from literary issues. A text can be a pseudepigraph whether it was claiming authority or not and whether that claim was accepted or not.⁵⁰

If a clear and functional usage for “pseudepigraphy”/“pseudepigraphic” can easily be imagined, the same cannot be said for the common practice of naming Qumran texts “Pseudo-*X*” (e.g. Pseudo-Jubilees, Pseudo-Ezekiel, Pseudo-Daniel). Once again, the reason for such labels seems to be a desire to indicate that the Qumran text is related in theme, content, or style to the book for which it is named, but does not seem to represent a copy or edition of that book.⁵¹ As Campbell points out, however, this label, like “Apocryphon of *X*,” tends to imply that the base text is somehow “true” and authoritative, and that the Qumran text related to it is somehow “false,” secondary, and lacking in authority—again denying the possibility that any text labeled “Pseudo-*X*” might itself have had scriptural status.⁵² On the other hand, even if we were to take the “Pseudo-” prefix simply to refer to a text that employs pseudepigraphy (as opposed to designating a relationship with an earlier text), we overlook the fact that, from a modern scholarly perspective, most of the *biblical* books of, e.g., Jeremiah and Ezekiel should also be considered “Pseudo-Jeremiah” and “Pseudo-Ezekiel.” Insofar as they did not derive from the person to whom they are attri-

50 Bernstein distinguishes “convenient” pseudepigraphy, which involves placing new material into the mouth of a specific character in an otherwise anonymous work and is not primarily intended as an authorizing device, from “strong” or “authoritative” pseudepigraphy, in which an entire work is cast as the speech of an ancient figure in an attempt to provide authority for the work in question (“Pseudepigraphy,” 6, 25). Furthermore, Hindy Najman has demonstrated that, while authorization may be one important function of pseudepigraphy, it is not the only one. In a recent essay, Najman shows how the pseudonymous attribution of 4 Ezra functions more as a “spiritual discipline” than an authorization strategy, a means by which the “real” author of 4 Ezra overcomes the distance between past and present by emulating (that is, metaphorically merging his identity with) an exemplary figure of the past. See Hindy Najman, “How Should We Contextualize Pseudepigrapha? Imitation and Emulation in 4 Ezra,” in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech, and Eibert Tigchelaar; JSJSup 122; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 529–36.

51 Bernstein notes that terms related to “apocryphon” and those using some form of “pseudo-”/“pseudepigraphic” have generally functioned equivalently in the labeling of Qumran texts (“Pseudepigraphy,” 2; see also Campbell, “Rewritten Bible,” 58), though he also mentions a qualitative distinction in the application of the two terms by Mark Smith in “4Q384, 4QpapApocryphon of Jeremiah B?” in *Qumran Cave 4.XIV, Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (ed. M. Broshi et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam; DJD 19; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 137–52. (“Pseudepigraphy,” 23).

52 Campbell, “Rewritten Bible,” 58.

buted, they are every bit as pseudepigraphic as the newly-discovered Qumran texts.⁵³ While we might use the term “pseudepigraphs” as a general descriptor of all of these texts (“biblical” books and Qumran materials alike), the many difficulties surrounding the prefix “pseudo-*X*” make it unhelpful as a labeling mechanism for Second Temple texts.

5. Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture

The term “Rewritten Bible” is usually traced back to Geza Vermes in his 1961 work *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*, where he uses it to describe the insertion of “haggadic development into the biblical narrative.”⁵⁴ Since then, it has come to denote *either* works like Jubilees, the Temple Scroll, and Josephus’s *Antiquities*, which follow the biblical text closely at some points but alter it through expansions, omissions, rearrangements, and other types of changes; *or* the editorial procedure by which such works were produced. Especially in the past decade, scholars have debated the proper application of the term and, indeed, whether it should be used at all to describe Second Temple Jewish texts.⁵⁵ This debate is ongoing, and here I will have to restrict myself to questions pertaining strictly to the term *per se*, both component parts of which (“Rewritten” and “Bible”) have been subject to criticism.

The most widely voiced terminological objection is to the “Bible” part of “Rewritten Bible,” mirroring the dissatisfaction with the term “Bible” in any context involving Second Temple texts. Since there was no “Bible” to be rewritten, the argument goes, it makes no sense to describe something as “Rewritten Bible.”⁵⁶ Thus, most recent scholarship on the subject speaks of “Rewritten Scripture” instead.

53 I believe this is what Campbell is getting at when he says: “Used so widely, the prefix [pseudo-] would lose its significance, for we would find ourselves speaking *inter alia* of Pseudo-Baruch, Pseudo-Isaiah, and Pseudo-1 Esdras, not to mention Pseudo-Pseudo-Jubilees” (“Rewritten Bible,” 58). Technically according to this model Jubilees should be called “Pseudo-Moses” or, better, “Pseudo-Angel of the Presence,” and the attempt to “pseudo” that “pseudo-text” simply highlights the unhelpfulness of this term.

54 Geza Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies* (2nd ed.; StPB 4; Leiden: Brill, 1973), 95.

55 For a new overview, see my article “Rewritten Scripture,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 323–36.

56 This view is expressed in many of the works cited in n. 6 above; see especially Petersen, “Rewritten Bible,” 286–88.

This substitution is helpful as long as a few caveats are kept in mind. First, in the customary understanding of “Rewritten Scripture,” “Scripture” (as well as “Bible” in the earlier formulation) refers to the *thing that is being rewritten*—the base text or *Vorlage* for the rewriting. Compositions labeled “Rewritten Bible” must be reworkings of a text that later came to be part of the Hebrew Bible. If “scripture” is defined as I suggested above—as any work considered sacred and authoritative to a particular group—then “Rewritten Scripture” would designate compositions that rewrite any text considered “scripture”—not just those texts that later made their way into the Bible. In the context of study of Second Temple Judaism, a reworked version of Genesis or Exodus could be labeled “Rewritten Scripture,” but so too could a reworked version of 1 Enoch or Jubilees, works that were equally considered “scriptural” at the time.⁵⁷ Thus, “Rewritten Scripture” is not synonymous with “Rewritten Bible,” but (at least potentially) could describe a wider range of texts. Here I should also reiterate a point made earlier, that the classification of a text as “Rewritten Scripture” is a literary judgment based on observation of parallels in content between two texts, and neither requires nor prevents the conclusion that the new text that results from the rewriting was itself considered “scripture” in the Second Temple period.⁵⁸

While numerous scholars agree that “Rewritten Scripture” is a more accurate term than “Rewritten Bible,” others have argued that the “Rewritten” part of “Rewritten Bible/Scripture” is also problematic. The objections raised by these scholars point to serious methodological

57 We should not let the fact confuse us that works that constitute “Rewritten Scripture” could themselves (insofar as they came to be viewed as scriptural) be subject to rewriting from which new works of “Rewritten Scripture” were produced. For example, many would regard the book of Deuteronomy as “Rewritten Scripture,” since its legal code at many points constitutes a rewriting of the Covenant Code of Exodus 21–23. Yet Deuteronomy itself (obviously having attained scriptural status) was subject to rewriting by the author of the Temple Scroll, who created a new “Rewritten Scripture” composition through his reworking of Deuteronomy and other books of the Torah. On Deuteronomy’s reworking of the Covenant Code, see especially Levinson, *Deuteronomy*.

58 The problems with distinguishing “scripture” from other texts that might have been viewed as authoritative but not sacred (see above, pp. 5–6) raise another issue that requires attention. The rewriting of a work implies that that work was in some way significant within the rewriters’ community (see n. 19 above), but does not prove that that work was actually considered scripture. If in the future we develop a clear way of distinguishing between scriptural and authoritative-but-not-scriptural works, and we have evidence that texts in the latter group were rewritten with the same methods and purposes as scriptural texts, then the suitability of the term “Rewritten Scripture” may have to be revisited.

questions: what does it mean when we label something “Rewritten,” and whose perspective is embodied in that term? The challenge lies in the argument that “Rewritten” was not a category that would have made sense to the ancient audiences of texts to which we give this label. That is, as Jonathan Campbell argues, ancient audiences would not have perceived e.g. Jubilees as “rewritten” at all; they would have seen it as parallel to but independent from Genesis.⁵⁹ As a result, he argues, the term “Rewritten Scripture” should be abandoned. Anders Klostergaard Petersen disagrees with the move to scuttle “Rewritten Scripture” altogether, but in a manner similar to Campbell he proposes that the intertextual relationships that lead modern scholars to classify a work as “Rewritten Scripture” would not have been the concern of the ancient consumers *or* producers of these texts.⁶⁰ Using terminology drawn from anthropology, Petersen suggests that “Rewritten Scripture” is a category that can function on an *etic* level but not an *emic* one—that is, one that is applied to a given culture by outside observers, but does not derive from the culture itself.⁶¹

Petersen and Campbell properly challenge us to articulate more clearly the level at which our terminology has explanatory power—do we expect that the categories we use would have been meaningful in the Second Temple period, and how is their usefulness altered if we do not? I am not convinced, however, that they are right to so readily deny that intertextual connections could have been meaningful to Second Temple authors and/or audiences. Campbell suggests that a pseudepigraphic work like Jubilees constituted “a ‘rewritten’ entity only for the anonymous elite that produced it.”⁶² True enough, but if the reworking of Genesis and Exodus was undertaken deliberately by the author(s) of Jubilees—that is, if the author(s) purposefully chose to create a text purportedly revealed to Moses on Sinai by reworking an existing text as opposed to simply composing a new revelation freely—then “rewriting” seems to have been a meaningful textual strategy. The resulting “rewritten” text may equally have constituted a meaningful textual category.⁶³ Who precisely would have been sensitive to the “rewritten”

59 “Rewritten Bible,” 49.

60 “The ancient author(s) or editor(s) did not conceive of their works in terms of our particular analytical focus on how their textual creations intertextually relate to scriptural writings proper” (Petersen, “Rewritten Bible,” 303).

61 Petersen, “Rewritten Bible,” 305.

62 “Rewritten Bible,” 49.

63 Similarly, Brooke’s argument that a definition of the category “rewritten Bible” must take into account the ways in which rewritten texts “seem to both confer and receive authority” from the texts they rewrite presumes that the connection between the

nature of a text—that is, whether anyone besides a text’s authors would have noticed its relationship to known scriptural texts—is a different matter.⁶⁴

A more serious challenge to viewing “rewritten” texts as a distinct textual category is implicit in the work of David Carr. Carr demonstrates the extent to which rewriting—revision and reconfiguration of earlier texts—was simply a normal mode of literary production in the ancient Mediterranean world.⁶⁵ If this is so, and most Second Temple Jewish texts were to a greater or lesser extent “rewritten,” it may not make sense to isolate a particular subset of these texts and give them the label “Rewritten Scripture.” While Carr makes a valuable point in highlighting the pervasiveness in the ancient world of literary reuse of earlier materials, it seems to me that real differences exist in the extent, nature, and purpose of literary reuse in various Second Temple compositions, and that it is necessary to take these differences seriously. The sustained rewriting found in Jubilees, the Temple Scroll, and Josephus’s *Antiquities* seems to function differently than the more limited reuse of scriptural themes and storylines in works like 1 Enoch and Ben Sira.⁶⁶ Much more work is necessary to chart with more precision the various forms of literary reuse found in Second Temple Jewish texts, and it must be recognized that the modes of reuse evidenced in any one text type will resemble to varying degrees the modes of reuse in other related yet distinct text types. As long as these caveats are kept in mind, however, I believe that “Rewritten Scripture” can reasonably be used as

new and old texts would have been meaningful in the Second Temple period, and not just to modern scholars; see George J. Brooke, “Genre Theory, Rewritten Bible and Peshar,” *DSD* 17 (2010): 361–386 (at p. 372).

- 64 Petersen correctly notes this issue, even as he seems to go even farther than Campbell in asserting that intertextual relations to scriptural texts were not important for the audiences *or* for the authors of what we would call “rewritten” texts (“Rewritten Bible,” 289, 303).
- 65 David M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), especially p. 34–46, 228–38.
- 66 The function and purpose of rewriting and of rewritten works is key to deciding if and how “Rewritten Scripture” should be considered a genre. In a forthcoming article I argue that at least some of the works frequently given the label “Rewritten Scripture” share enough strategies and goals that they may constitute a genre, so long as genre is understood, as in contemporary genre theory, as a flexible and dynamic system of classification. See, preliminarily, Molly M. Zahn, “The Question of Genre in Rewritten Scripture: A Reassessment” (paper presented at the 7th meeting of the IOQS, Helsinki 2010).

a label for works or sections of works that show sustained close engagement with an earlier scriptural text.⁶⁷

—

6. Concluding Reflections

The preceding remarks on “Rewritten Scripture” indicate that, to a certain extent, we are caught between a rock and a hard place: to understand the literature and culture of Second Temple Judaism as fully as possible, we must try to avoid projecting our own conceptions and categories onto the data, but we do not know—and can only reconstruct through analysis of this incomplete data—which conceptions and categories were operative at the time this literature was produced. That is, we *need* to develop categories and labels that reflect *our* best understanding of the data (since that is all we can do), while at the same time leaving our terminology open to correction from improving understanding of the data itself.⁶⁸ This dialectical process can be seen already in the move towards the term “scripture” in place of “Bible.” The current dissatisfaction with much of the terminology used to speak about Second Temple texts constitutes another step in the process, reflecting the fact that our understanding of the data has improved to the point where terminology that has become traditional is no longer regarded as sufficient.

I would like to close, now that I have highlighted some of the difficulties with many of these traditional terms, by offering some suggestions of my own as to how to proceed. These suggestions are rooted in my sense, outlined above, that the key thing that scholars have been trying to highlight with terms like “Rewritten Scripture,” “Apocryphon of X,” “Pseudo-X,” and so on is a *literary* relationship—one of content, theme, or style—between a newly-discovered work and a known work (usually one known from the Hebrew Bible).

First, although problems emerge regarding the general terms “parabiblical” and “parascriptural,” it seems it would still be useful to build on the idea of “para-” texts by grouping lesser-known or fragmentary

67 Note that this delineation of Rewritten Scripture agrees in large measure with Bernstein, “Rewritten Bible,” 195. I would perhaps differ from Bernstein in allowing for blurrier edges of the genre; for example, I would be more inclined than Bernstein to regard works such as the Targumim as Rewritten Scripture in some sense. As my forthcoming article (see previous note) will demonstrate, a more flexible notion of genre may help us to describe more precisely how “borderline” phenomena like paraphrastic translations relate to core representatives of the genre.

68 Similarly, see Ulrich, “Methodological Reflections,” 161.

texts with better-known texts to which they show a clear relationship. Thus we could use labels like “para-Deuteronomy” or “para-Daniel” for texts showing specific connections to those books. As Kraft points out, the “para-” prefix can admit a variety of different textual relationships: it could be used to denote a source or earlier form of a work, a further development of that work, or a parallel development of shared themes or content.⁶⁹ Using a term like “para-Deuteronomy” would do no more than indicate that a given text, about which we may or may not be able to say much else, has something to do with what we know as the book of Deuteronomy. This is not a matter of giving a higher status to the book of Deuteronomy (much less any specific form thereof!); it is simply a way of classifying what is unfamiliar or fragmentary in light of what is more fully known. “Para-X” (e.g. “para-Deuteronomy”) could be used either as a name for a specific composition that is too fragmentary to be given any other name, or it could be used in the phrase “para-X literature” (e.g. “para-Deuteronomy literature”) to refer to a larger category of compositions with links to the book in question.⁷⁰ Thus for example the Prayer of Nabonidus (4Q242) as well as other texts such as those currently labeled 4QapocrDan ar (4Q246) and Pseudo-Daniel (4QpsDan^{a-c} = 4Q243–245) could all be grouped together as “para-Daniel literature.” Given the problems with both “parabiblical” and “parascriptural” discussed above, it is probably best to avoid any broader label that would apply to all the texts labeled “para-” something, unless we use a very vague term like “para-” literature or “para-” texts.⁷¹

It could be objected that this use of “para” still privileges works that ultimately end up in the Hebrew Bible, since in most cases the X in the formula “para-X” will be a biblical text (though not in all cases: for example, the texts currently labeled “Pseudo-Jubilees” [4Q225–227] might more neutrally be referred to as “para-Jubilees”). In a way this objection is valid, but it seems to me that the problem is largely unavoidable given the current state of our knowledge. Precisely *because of* their later canonical status, it is the books that ended up the Hebrew

69 See Kraft’s summary definition of “para-” as “analogous or parallel to, but separate from or going beyond, what is denoted by the root word” (“Para-Mania,” 8), and his discussion of “Paratextual Worlds” on pp. 18–22.

70 Note that there is still a basic literary distinction being made here between manuscript copies of the work in question (including revised copies or “new literary editions”) and new, independent compositions.

71 The placement of the quotation marks is important: we would not want to call these texts “para-literature” (which might imply that they are associated with literature but are not themselves literature!).

Bible that are the best-known and best-understood by modern scholars and thus inevitably serve as points of comparison for lesser-known works. On the other hand, the primacy of these works is not entirely anachronistic: the evidence indicates that many of the works that were later included in the Hebrew Bible were in fact already regarded as sacred and authoritative in the Second Temple period.⁷² The important thing is that we not artificially limit the group of texts with which we might associate other “para-”texts to those that later ended up in the Hebrew Bible, or indeed even to those that we believe were considered scriptural in the Second Temple period.⁷³ As our knowledge and understanding of this period deepens, it is possible, even likely, that our ideas about which texts should be described as “para-”texts of other texts will change.

My second suggestion picks up where the usefulness of the “para-” terminology begins to diminish. Grouping texts with clusters of “para-” texts is only one, very general means of classification, indicating as it does only *some sort of* literary relationship between two texts, without offering any further information about the nature of this relationship or the nature of the works in question.⁷⁴ In order to develop adequate terminology for talking about Second Temple literature that relates in some way to scripture, we need to explore many other ways of categorizing and grouping texts. This is not a matter of finding the single best classificatory label for a given work. Recent thought on the issue of genre has emphasized that all texts can be classified in multiple ways, depending upon who is doing the classifying and the criteria used, and that texts can participate in multiple genres or categories simultaneously.⁷⁵ Instead of finding the appropriate pigeonhole for each work, we should perhaps be creating something more like a Venn diagram, in which the work can be located at the intersection of all the different categories in which it participates. These categories would include aspects of literary form, style, and content (poetry, prose; law, narrative;

72 See the works of VanderKam and Lange cited in n. 8 above.

73 One might ask, for instance, if it might be fair to refer to the various rule texts from Qumran as “para-1QS” texts (if we presume that 1QS was regarded by the Qumranites as authoritative but not scriptural; see Campbell, “Rewritten Bible,” 66).

74 See Brooke’s observation that the term “parabiblical” most properly operates as an “umbrella term” and should not be construed as a “narrowly defined genre”; Brooke, “Genre Theory,” 369.

75 For helpful overviews of recent developments in the study of genre, see Amy J. Devitt, *Writing Genres* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2004); Carol A. Newsom, “Pairing Research Questions and Theories of Genre: A Case Study of the Hodayot,” *DSD* 17 (2010): 270–88.

pseudepigraphy, anonymity, named authorship; etc.) as well as descriptions of how a given work rewrites or reuses an earlier work, insofar as this can be determined. Thus for example, if we were to decide that the book of Jubilees can fairly be placed in a category called *Rewritten Scripture*, it would still be necessary to further characterize Jubilees with a variety of other descriptive and generic labels: as a narrative text, as a “para-Genesis” text, as possibly belonging to the genre *Apocalypse*, as a pseudepigraph, and (in view of its probable authoritative status) as scripture. Each of these descriptors binds Jubilees to a different subset of Second Temple literature and allows us to see points of contact that a single generic label (“Apocalypse,” “Rewritten Scripture”) might tend to obscure. Systematic mapping of texts’ participation in categories of various types should give us a much better sense of the similarities and differences between different types of texts and facilitate the development of appropriate terminology to describe these interrelationships.

Third, I would suggest that special care be taken to keep questions of authority and authoritative status separate from questions pertaining to literary form and mode of production. I have indicated above how conflation of these two issues has frequently led to confusion in the discussion of Second Temple texts that constitute or are related to scripture. It is perfectly legitimate and necessary, of course, to try to determine which works were viewed as possessing scriptural authority in this period (and by whom) and which works were more likely viewed as authoritative but not scriptural or not authoritative at all. But such determinations, especially given the paucity of information regarding the reception of many of these texts, should not constitute the primary basis for textual classification, as the distinction biblical/nonbiblical did for so long. While that primary division made good sense in the early days of Scrolls research, when the vast diversity of the material had not yet become apparent, from our perspective more than sixty years later it has proved inadequate.⁷⁶ As a result, judgments about the authoritative status of late Second Temple texts, though they constitute an important aspect of the analysis of these texts, should be kept separate from—and must not be given priority over—analysis of each text’s content, form, and relationship to other known texts.

The above reflections and tentative suggestions are meant to help advance the process of developing a suitable terminology for talking about Second Temple Jewish texts related to what we now know as the Hebrew Bible. Far from constituting some sort of final word on the

⁷⁶ See the comments of Ulrich, “Methodological Reflections,” 154.

issue, it is my hope that they will spur further discussion, debate, and clarification. Only through such dialogue can we hope to develop ways of talking about these texts that reflect the current state of our understanding—and only through the development of new ways of talking will we gradually develop new ways of thinking as well.

Bibliography

- Barton, John. *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Bernstein, Moshe J. "Pseudepigraphy in the Qumran Scrolls: Categories and Functions." Pages 1–26 in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon and Michael E. Stone. STDJ 31. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . "'Rewritten Bible': A Generic Category Which Has Outlived its Usefulness?" *Textus* 22 (2005): 169–96.
- . "What Has Happened to the Laws? The Treatment of Legal Material in 4QReworked Pentateuch." *DSD* 15 (2008): 24–49.
- Brooke, George J. "Rewritten Bible." Pages 777–81 in *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . "The Rewritten Law, Prophets and Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible." Pages 31–40 in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*. Edited by Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov. London: British Library, 2002.
- . "Between Authority and Canon: The Significance of Reworking the Bible for Understanding the Canonical Process." Pages 85–104 in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran*. Edited by Esther Chazon et al. STDJ 58. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- . "The Books of Chronicles and the Scrolls from Qumran." Pages 35–48 in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*. Edited by Robert Rezetko, Timothy H. Lim, and W. Brian Aucker. VTSup 113. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- . "From Bible to Midrash: Approaches to Biblical Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls by Modern Interpreters." Pages 1–19 in *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003–2006*. Edited by Anders Klostergaard Petersen et al. STDJ 80. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- . "Genre Theory, Rewritten Bible and Peshet." *DSD* 17 (2010): 361–386.
- Campbell, Jonathan G. "'Rewritten Bible' and 'Parabiblical Texts': A Terminological and Methodological Critique." Pages 43–68 in *New Directions in Qumran Studies*. Edited by Jonathan G. Campbell, William John Lyons, and Lloyd K. Pietersen. LSTS 52. London: T & T Clark, 2005.
- Carr, David M. *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

- Chiesa, Bruno. "Biblical and Parabiblical Texts from Qumran." *Henoah* 20 (1998): 131–51.
- Crawford, Sidnie White. "The 'Rewritten' Bible at Qumran: A Look at Three Texts." *ErIsr* 26 (1999): 1–8 [Eng.].
- . *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Deutscher, Guy. "Does Your Language Shape How You Think?." *New York Times Magazine*, 29 August 2010. Cited 27 August 2010. Online: <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/29/magazine/29language-t.html?src=me&ref=homepage>.
- Devitt, Amy J. *Writing Genres*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2004.
- Falk, Daniel K. *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures among the Dead Sea Scrolls*. London: T & T Clark, 2007.
- Graham, William A. *Beyond the Written Word: Oral Aspects of Scripture in the History of Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- . "Scripture." Pages 133–145 in vol. 13 of *The Encyclopedia of Religion*. Edited by Mircea Eliade et al. 16 vols. New York: Macmillan, 1987.
- Hayward, C. T. R. "Rewritten Bible." Pages 595–98 in *A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*. Edited by R. J. Coggins and J. L. Houlden. London: SCM, 1990.
- Kraft, Robert A. "Para-mania: Beside, Before and Beyond Bible Studies." *JBL* 126 (2007): 5–27.
- Lange, Armin. "The Status of the Biblical Texts in the Qumran Corpus and the Canonical Process." Pages 21–30 in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*. Edited by Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov. London: British Library, 2002.
- Levinson, Bernard M. *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- and Molly M. Zahn. "Revelation Regained: The Hermeneutics of כִּי and מִן in the Temple Scroll." *DSD* 9 (2002): 295–346.
- Lim, Timothy H. "Authoritative Scriptures and the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 303–22 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Najman, Hindy. *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*. JSJSup 77. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- . "How Should We Contextualize Pseudepigrapha? Imitation and Emulation in 4 Ezra." Pages 529–36 in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*. Edited by Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech, and Eibert Tigchelaar. JSJSup 122. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Newsom, Carol A. "Pairing Research Questions and Theories of Genre: A Case Study of the Hodayot." *DSD* 17 (2010): 270–88.
- Petersen, Anders Klostergaard. "Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon—Genre, Textual Strategy, or Canonical Anachronism." Pages 285–306 in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour*

- of Florentino García Martínez. Edited by Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech, and Eibert Tigchelaar. JSJSup 122. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Ruether, Rosemary Radford. *Sexism and God-Talk*. Boston: Beacon, 1983.
- Smith, Mark. "4Q384, 4QpapApocryphon of Jeremiah B?" Pages 137–52 in *Qumran Cave 4.XIV, Parabiblical Texts, Part 2*. Edited by M. Broshi et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam. DJD 19. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.
- Smith, Wilfred Cantwell. *What is Scripture? A Comparative Approach*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- Stone, Michael E. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Pseudepigrapha." *DSD* 3 (1996): 270–95.
- Tov, Emanuel. "Biblical Texts as Reworked in Some Qumran Manuscripts with Special Attention to 4QRP and 4QParaGen-Exod." Pages 111–34 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.
- . Introduction to *Qumran Cave 4.VIII, Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*. Edited by H. Attridge et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam. DJD 13. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- Trebolle Barrera, Julio. "A 'Canon within a Canon': Two Series of Old Testament Books Differently Transmitted, Interpreted and Authorized." *RevQ* 19 (2000): 383–99.
- Ulrich, Eugene. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- . "The Notion and Definition of Canon." Pages 21–35 in *The Canon Debate*. Edited by Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002.
- . "Methodological Reflections on Determining Scriptural Status in First Century Judaism." Pages 145–61 in *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods*. Edited by Maxine L. Grossman. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Zahn, Molly M. "New Voices, Ancient Words: The Temple Scroll's Reuse of the Bible." Pages 435–58 in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*. Edited by John Day. LHB/OTS 422. London: T & T Clark, 2005.
- . "Rewritten Scripture." Pages 323–36 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- . "The Question of Genre in Rewritten Scripture: A Reassessment." Paper presented at the 7th meeting of the IOQS. Helsinki, 2010.
- VanderKam, James C. "Authoritative Literature in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *DSD* 5 (1998): 382–402.
- . "The Wording of Biblical Citations in Some Rewritten Scriptural Works." Pages 41–56 in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*. Edited by Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov. London: British Library, 2002.
- and Peter W. Flint. *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. London: T & T Clark, 2005.

Vermes, Geza. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*. 2nd ed. StPB 4. Leiden: Brill, 1973.