

Reworked Pentateuch

[The next group of manuscripts along the spectrum to be considered is the texts that have been gathered under the rubric "Reworked Pentateuch." These manuscripts demonstrate that the tradition of scribal exegesis discussed in the Introduction and demonstrated by the pre-Samaritan manuscripts continued well into the late Second Temple period. The Reworked Pentateuch manuscripts include 4Q364, 4Q365, 4Q366 and 4Q367.1 A fifth manuscript, 4Q158, is often grouped along with the other four, although it was originally published independently as "Biblical Paraphrase .112](#)

[When Emanuel Tov and I first began work on these manuscripts in the early 1990s, and subsequently in the editio princeps, we spoke about them in terms of a single "composition" written by an "author," who used a "biblical base text," which he then extensively altered. In the decade since these initial publications, as our knowledge of the state of the text of Scripture in the Second Temple period has grown, such designations are no longer apt and should be rejected \(see Introduction\). Rather, what we see in this group of texts, which is probably more extensive than the original five, is the next point on our spectrum.'](#) These texts are the product of scribal interpretation, still marked mainly by harmonistic editing, but with one important addition: the insertion of outside material into the text, material not found in other parts of what we now recognize as the Pentateuch. This change in scribal procedure raises the question of the authority and function of these texts in the Second Temple period, a question I shall attempt to answer at the end of this chapter. First, let us take a closer look at these texts in order to ascertain their characteristics.

The Reworked Pentateuch Group as Harmonizing Texts

[The main exemplars of this category are the manuscripts 4QReworked Pentateuchb \(4Q364\) and 4QReworked Pentateuchc \(4Q365\), because they are the most extensively preserved.](#) Both manuscripts were copied sometime between 75-50 B.C.E., the late Hasmonaean period. Each probably contained a text of what we now call the entire Pentateuch, in the familiar order of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus (note that 4Q364 does not contain any fragments from Leviticus), Numbers, and Deuteronomy. This is very compelling evidence that by the first century B.C.E. these books were considered a discrete unit of Scripture, although the five books continued to be copied separately as well (see, e.g., 4QDeutg, which dates from the second half of the first century C.E.).

4Q364 and 4Q365 contain only one small fragment of overlapping text, at Exod 26:33-35 (4Q364, frg. 17; 4Q365, frgs. 8a-b). At this overlap the two manuscripts share a reading against the witnesses of the Masoretic Text and the Samaritan Pentateuch: .11 1 (with the definite article) vs. 111K (the construct form without the definite article). No firm conclusions can be drawn from this shared reading, but it may point to a common textual tradition.

[Both 4Q364 and 4Q365 belong in the pre-Samaritan textual tradition that was discussed in the preceding chapter. This tradition has been described as harmonistic or expansive, and we can see those scribal techniques at work in 4Q364 and 4Q365. The most complete exemplar of this group of texts is the Samaritan Pentateuch \(prior to its sectarian editing by the Samaritan community\): 4Q364 and 4Q365 are often in agreement with the Samaritan Pentateuch against other textual witnesses.'](#) However, it is a mistake to claim that 4Q364 or 4Q365 used the pre-Samaritan text as its "base text"; rather, it is more exact to say that both manuscripts come out of the same scribal trajectory and therefore share a common exegetical tradition, which is manifested in the large number of agreements among the texts. However, there are also disagreements, which indicate that these texts are not copies of one another but are part of a tradition in which an individual scribe (or group of scribes) had freedom to manipulate a received text within a broader body of tradition. The manuscripts themselves illustrate this.

4Q364 contains many examples of small exegetical comments, which function as aids to the reader within the narrative flow of the text. The very first preserved fragment gives an example of this phenomenon, in Gen 25:19:

[And these are the descendants of] saac, the son of Abraham; [he begat Isaac] whom Sarah [his] wife bore] to him.

The phrase "whom Sarah his wife bore to him" is not found in any other textual witness to v. 19 and is probably added in the tradition to remind the reader that Isaac is the son of Sarah (unlike Ishmael, the son of Hagar) and therefore the heir to God's promise to Abraham earlier in Genesis. Notice that in Gen 25:12, where the genealogy of Ishmael begins, Ishmael is identified as the son of Hagar and thus by implication as not the heir to the promise. The fact that v. 12 identifies Ishmael's mother may have prompted the identification of Isaac's mother in v. 19 of 4Q364. Whether this was done by the scribe of 4Q364 or earlier in the tradition, we cannot say.

4Q365 contains the same type of short exegetical comment. Frg. 5 contains Exod 14:10:

[And] they looked, and behold, the Egyptians were coming after the[m, and they feared greatly ...] . . . thousand horses and six hundred [chari]ots ...

similar in the version. Exod 14:7 mentions that Pharaoh sent out six hundred chariots after the Israelites; that number is repeated here in the exegetical comment. The number of horses (either two thousand or some other multiple of a thousand; since the context is broken we cannot be sure) is not mentioned in the immediate context of Exodus 14; however, the phrase "two thousand horses" appears in 2 Kgs 18:23 (= Isa 36:8), in the Rabshakeh's taunting speech to the Israelites. This reference may have prompted the scribal choice made here in Exodus. As in the example from 4Q364, whether this exegetical comment was added by the scribe of 4Q365 or earlier, we cannot tell.

4Q364 and 4Q365 also contain examples of the type of major harmonistic editing considered characteristic of the group of texts exemplified by the pre-Samaritan text. Once again, however, the major harmonistic changes are not identical to the pre-Samaritan text, indicating that we are witnessing a scribal tradition of harmonizing exegesis, not the phenomenon of one manuscript copying another (although this of course did happen).

The first example of major harmonizing that I want to present from 4Q364 also happens to occur in the Samaritan Pentateuch. It is found in Genesis 30-31, part of the Jacob cycle, in which Jacob tells his wives of the dream he has had prompting him to return to the land of Canaan. In the textual tradition witnessed by the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint, Jacob merely reports to his wives that he has had this dream:

"At the mating time of the flocks, I raised my eyes and I saw in a dream - the he-goats mating with the flock were striped, speckled, and mottled. And an angel of God said to me in the dream, 'Jacob!' and I said, 'Here I am: And he said, 'Raise your eyes and see all the he-goats mating with the flocks are striped, speckled, and mottled, because I have seen all that Laban has done to you. I am the god of Bethel, where you anointed a pillar, where you vowed a vow to me. Now, arise, go forth from this land and return to the land of your birth.'" (Gen 31:10-13)

However, we never actually see Jacob having the dream. This leaves an interpretive gap in the text; does Jacob really have the dream he reports, or is he making it up as a convenient excuse to return to Canaan? Since the latter suggestion may cast doubt on the patriarch's rectitude, the harmonistic scribal tradition filled the gap by supplying the dream earlier, in what is now ch. 30. This is how the harmonization appears in 4Q364, frgs. 4b-e, col. ii, lines 18-26:

(Gen 30:36) [and he (Laban) set a] th[ree-days' journey between himself and Jacob, and Jacob was pasturing[the remainder of] Laban's flock. vacat And [the messenger of God] spok[e to Jacob in a dream, and he said, "Jacob!" and he said,] "H[ere I am]" And he said, "Raise [your] eyes, and see all the he-goats mating with the flock are striped, speckled[and mottled, because I have seen all that Laban has done to you. I am the god of Bethel, w] here[you anointed a pillar and where you vowed a vow to me. And now, rise, go forth] f[rom this land and return to the land of your] f[ather, and I will do good with you" ...]

The careful reader will note that this text is extensively reconstructed in 4Q364. We are able to do this because the same harmonization occurs in the Samaritan Pentateuch, where we have the complete text. The exegetical tradition has taken Jacob's report of his dream to Leah and Rachel in Gen 31:11-13 and repeated it almost verbatim here. This is an anticipatory harmonization; it reassures the reader that Jacob actually had the dream he reports. The fact that it occurs in both 4Q364 and the Samaritan Pentateuch points to a common exegetical tradition.

4Q364 also contains examples of major harmonizations that it does not share with the Samaritan Pentateuch. Since 4Q364 is a fragmentary text, we cannot be entirely certain of the nature and purpose of these harmonizations, but it is fairly clear that harmonizing activity is occurring in the text. We also, of course, are not certain whether the harmonizations were introduced by the scribe of 4Q364 or earlier.

The first example is found on frg. 14, which contains the text of Exod 24:12-14, recounting God's command to Moses to come up to Mount Sinai to receive the tablets of the law. Prior to the Exodus text, however, frg. 14 contains two lines of extremely broken material, unique to 4Q364, ending with the phrase "on the slopes of the mountain" (f7,1 1 n PWI:1). This same phrase occurs in Exod 19:17, part of the Sinai theophany. In 19:20, God also summons Moses up the mountain. What seems to be happening in 4Q364 is the use of (at least) phrases from the earlier theophany narrated in Exodus 19 before the parallel text in Exodus 24. Since 4Q364 is so fragmentary, and we do not have any other fragments containing Exodus 19, it is also possible that 4Q364 skipped from Exod 19:17 to Exod 24:12, leaving out the intervening chapters. However, the letter remains of frg. 14 do not fit the latter explanation well; there seem to be words on frg. 14 which do not occur in Exod 19:17. Therefore, the suggestion that an otherwise unknown harmonization has occurred seems more likely.

The second example of a harmonization that 4Q364 does not share with the Samaritan Pentateuch occurs in frgs. 23a-b, col. i. This harmonization occurs before the text of Deut 2:8-14. In this passage of Deuteronomy Moses is retelling the story of the Israelites' journey through Transjordan and their avoidance of Edom and Moab. Right before Deut 2:8, 4Q364 inserts a passage from the parallel text in Num 20:14-18:

saying, "you are crossing the territory of your brethren, the Edomites, who dwell in Seir. They will fear you, but be careful, do not provoke them. For I will not give to you from their land, not so much as a foot can tread. For I have given to Esau Mt. Seir as an inheritance. You shall buy food from them with money, and you shall eat; and likewise water you will purchase from them with money, and you will drink. For the LORD your God has blessed you in all your doings. He has watched over your wanderings in this great desert these forty years; the LORD your God has been with you, you have lacked nothing.

From Kadesh, Moses sent messengers to the king of Edom: "Thus says your brother Israel: You know all the hardships that have befallen us; that our ancestors went down to Egypt, that we dwelt in Egypt a long time, and that the Egyptians dealt harshly with us and our ancestors.

Num 20:17-18 (MT)

We cried to the LORD and he heard our plea, and he sent a messenger who freed us from Egypt. Now we are in Kadesh, the town on the border of your territory. Let us cross your country. We will not cross in the field or in the vineyard, and we will not drink water from the well; we will go on the King's Road; we will not swerve to the right or left until we reach your border." But Edom said to him, "You shall not cross over me lest with the sword I come out to meet you."

4Q364 (extant)

. . . c]ross
in the field or in the vinea[rd,
and we will n[ot] drink water from
the well; we will go on the King's
Road;] we will n[ot] swerve to the
right or left [until we reach
your border." But *he* said,]
"You shall not cro[ss
over] me lest [with the sword
I come out to meet you" . . .
*Then we moved away
from our brethren, the
the children of Esau . . .*

Deut 2:4-8

*Then we moved away
from our brethren,
the children of Esau . . .*

[Although 4Q364 is fragmentary, we can see the harmonization that has occurred. Moses' negotiation with the king of Edom, reported in Numbers 20, has been inserted in 4Q364 in the parallel report of the journey in Deuteronomy. What is particularly interesting about this harmonization is that it imports material from Numbers into Deuteronomy. In the tradition exemplified in the pre-Samaritan texts, the](#)

4Q365 does not share any large harmonizations with the Samaritan Pentateuch, but it does contain a harmonization similar to one in 4QNumb, another member of the group of harmonizing, or pre-Samaritan, texts. This harmonization occurs on frg. 36, where Num 27:11 is followed immediately (without even a paragraph break) by Num 36:1-2, the two pericopes in Numbers concerning the inheritance of the daughters of Zelophehad. Since 4Q365 is fragmentary, it is impossible to tell if the passage from ch. 36 has been transferred to the middle of ch. 27 or whether 27:1-11 has been transferred to the beginning of ch. 36. The preserved text follows:

(27:11) If [his father] had no[brothers, then you shall give his inheritance to his nearest relative in his clan,] and he shall inherit i[t. This will be the law of procedure for the children of Israel, according as the LORD commanded] Moses. (36:1-2) And[the heads of families belonging to the clans of Gilead son of Machir, son of Manasseh, from the clans] of Joseph drew near before[Moses and before the leaders, the heads of the families belonging to the children of] Israel, and they said, ["The LORD commanded my lord to give the land in inheritance] by lot to [the children of Israel...."

[In 4QNumb, it appears as if part of Numbers 27 has been inserted into Numbers 36, in a slightly different way than in 4Q365.1](#) This is another example, from two different manuscripts related to the pre-Samaritan group, of a particular exegetical tradition that manifests itself in different ways in different manuscripts.

Another example of a harmonizing change in 4Q365 is found on frg. 28. This fragment contains the text of Num 4:47-49 (the end of ch. 4), followed by a blank line, then continuing with Num Ti. The blank line may be a signal to the reader that an exegetical change has occurred, but we cannot be certain. The reason for the joining together of these two passages is that both concern the service of the tabernacle; ch. 4 ends with the census of the Levites to determine who was eligible to serve in the tabernacle; ch. 7 begins with the completion of the tabernacle. The intervening material in chs. 5 and 6 is a miscellaneous collection of laws not relating to the service of the tabernacle; therefore it makes exegetical sense to join the end of ch. 4 with the beginning of ch. 7. Whether 4Q365 completely omitted chs. 5 and 6 or moved their contents to other places in the manuscript we do not know; no fragments of those chapters remain. We also cannot determine if this exegetical change originated with the scribe of 4Q365 or earlier in the tradition.

The Addition of "New" Material into the Text

Thus far we have been discussing the characteristics of 4Q364 and 4Q365 that mark them as part of the group of texts identified as pre-Samaritan, or harmonistic. However, 4Q364 and 4Q365, as part of the group of texts called Reworked Pentateuch, move yet a step further along the spectrum. They do this by adding new material into their received text, thereby "hyperexpanding" the text of the Pentateuch. This step along the spectrum is part of the tradition of scribal exegesis we have been discussing, and it does distance these texts still further from the (shorter) texts of the proto-rabbinic group, which do not belong within the same tradition of scribal exegesis.

There are three major examples of this step toward "hyperexpansion" in 4Q364 and 4Q365. The first, in 4Q364, occurs in frg. 3, col. ii. The last two lines of this fragment contain Gen 28:6, which reads "And Esau saw that [Isaac had blessed Jacob and sent him] to Pa[ddan] Aram, to take for himself from[there a wife. . . ." Preceding this verse come six lines of text not known (in its entirety) from other sources. The lines are as follows:

1. him you shall see [
2. you shall see in peace [
3. your death, and to [your] eyes[
4. the two of you. And he called[
5. to her all the wo[r]ds
6. after Jacob her son[

[The lines appear to contain a dialogue between Isaac and Rebekah, in which Rebekah grieves over Jacob's departure and Isaac attempts to comfort her. This additional material is paralleled in a variety of sources available in the Second Temple period. The first is the text of Genesis itself; the phrase "the two of you" echoes the identical phrase in Gen 27:45, in which Rebekah, while sending Jacob away, says to him, "Why should I lose even the two of you in one day?"⁸ If this had been the only line extant, we would probably surmise that a simple harmonization had occurred. However, the remainder of the lines does not contain echoes of pentateuchal passages, but rather other texts from the period. Jubilees 27, which narrates the same scene as Genesis 28, contains the lines "The spirit of Rebecca was grieved after Jacob her son" \(Jub 27:14\) and "we see him in peace" \(Jub 27:17\). The texts are not exact copies of one another, but certainly point to the same interpretive tradition, manifest in slightly different ways in the two works. As I shall argue in the chapter on Jubilees, the Reworked Pentateuch texts and Jubilees stem from the same scribal tradition.](#)

found in five manuscripts at Qumran. A common exegetical addition seems to be at work among these three texts.

[4Q365 contains two large additions, at different points in the text and of different types. One of these additions is narrative in nature, the other legal.](#)⁹ The first occurs in frgs. 6a-c, col. ii, in the text of Exodus 15. Frg. 6b (part of col. i) of 4Q365 contains Exod 15:16-20 in its extant text. Since we do not have the bottom of the fragment, it is likely that the text continued through v. 21. Verse 22 begins on line 8 of frg. 6a, col. ii. Between v. 21, which begins at the end of col. i, and v. 22, which commences on line 8 of col. ii, intervene at least seven lines of text not found in any other witness to the text of Exodus. The lines read as follows:

- i. you despised [
2. for the majesty of[
3. You are great, O deliverer [
4. the hope of the enemy has perished, and he has cea[sed/is forgotten....
5. they perished in the mighty waters, the enemy[
6. Extol the one who raises up, [a ra]nsom you gave[
7. [do] ing gloriously[

[Given the position of these lines on col. ii, it is clear that they are the fragmentary remains of a Song of Miriam, added into the text of Exodus 15 after the snippet of song that Miriam sings in 15:21, a mere repetition of the first verse of the song that Moses sings in 15:1-18. The addition was prompted by what could be perceived as an interpretive gap in the text: did Miriam only repeat the refrain of Moses' song, or did she sing a longer song? 4Q365 answers the latter question affirmatively, in the ancient tradition of victory songs sung by women.](#)¹⁰

The additional material draws on the Song of Moses as its primary inspiration: [the phrase "in the mighty waters" is repeated from 15:10, and the root q'-h, here translated as "majesty" \(line 2\) and "gloriously" \(line 7\), occurs in 15:1, 7, and 21. In addition to the Song of Moses, the scribe\(s\) drew on other texts to construct Miriam's Song: the phrase "you are great" occurs in Jer 10:6 and Ps 86:10; "the hope of the enemy has perished" bears a resemblance to Prov 10:28, "and the hope of the wicked will perish"; and "\[do\] ing gloriously" resembles Isa 12:5: "he has done gloriously." Finally, there may be connections at the level of motif to other women's victory songs like Judith 16 and the later Magnificat of Mary in Luke 1. These motifs are the greatness of God and the elevation of the weak through God's action.](#)

Thus, the Song of Miriam is clearly the product of scribal exegesis; it demonstrates the skilful use of other texts to create something new, something that fills an interpretive gap in the received text. This Song does not reappear in other parts of the Jewish tradition; Josephus and the rabbis have no knowledge of it, and it disappeared until its rediscovery in Cave 4.

The second major addition preserved in 4Q365 is found on frg. 23. This fragment begins with Lev 23:42-24:2. Leviticus 23 contains a festival calendar, which ends in v. 44 with "Thus Moses declared the festivals of the LORD to the children of Israel." That is, according to the Torah, the festivals enumerated in ch. 23 are the only festivals that God commanded to Moses on Mount Sinai. However, in the course of time in the Second Temple period the Jewish festival calendar had expanded, raising the question of whether or not these new festivals were in fact ordained by God. The festivals of Purim and Hanukkah began to be celebrated in the late Second Temple period by some but not all groups of Jews. For example, there is no evidence that the Essene community who lived at Qumran celebrated either festival. One of the reasons for this is that neither festival originated with Moses; Purim is associated with the book of Esther, while Hanukkah comes about during the period of the Maccabees in the second century B.C.E. However, the Qumran group did celebrate other festivals that are not found in the received text of Leviticus, such as the harvest festivals of New Wine and New Oil. How were these evidently non-Mosaic festivals justified?

One answer maybe found in frg. 23 of 4Q365, which illustrates an interpretive tradition in which the newer festivals were "discovered" by exegesis from the existing festivals and thus given the Mosaic imprimatur. Fragment 23 gives the continuous text of Leviticus from 23:42-24:1, but suddenly, after beginning 24:2, it switches without warning and without mark to material that is otherwise unknown to Leviticus. In other words, the scribe(s) is using the received text of Leviticus as a vehicle for exegesis and is hyperexpanding it. This is not "new composition," but a handing on of the book of Leviticus as interpreted within a particular legal tradition, a priestly-levitical legal tradition we will find in other Qumran scrolls (see below). The expansion fills in an interpretive gap in the mind of the reader, if not the text: if these festivals we celebrate are not mentioned in the Law of Moses, why do we celebrate them? The expansion answers the question by finding the justification for the new festivals within the festival calendar in Leviticus 23. The scribe(s) adds regulations concerning the wood offering for the temple, which evidently follows the festival of New Oil. The latter is a harvest festival, a natural continuation of the "sheaf of first fruits," which was associated with the barley harvest, and the harvest festival of grain already enumerated in Lev 23:10-14,15-21. The wood offering is a necessity for the sacrifices in the temple and is mentioned in the book of Nehemiah (10:35; 13:31), where, however, the offering is collected differently. 4Q365's text reads as follows, beginning with line 4:

4. and the LORD spoke to Moses, saying, "Command the children of Israel, saying, when you come to the land which

- 6. [the] case which you will burn for me in the land, to arrange them upon the altar of the burnt offering [and] the sacrifice
- 7. . . . for Passover sacrifices and for whole burnt-offerings and for thank offerings and for free-will offerings and for burnt-offerings, daily]
- 8. ...] ... and for the d[o]ors and for all the work of the house, [they] will bring ...
- 9. . . . [the] stival of New Oil, they will bring the wood two [...
- io. ...] those who bring on the fir[s]t day, Levi [..
- ii. ... Reu]ben and Simeon[and on the] four[th] day [.. .

The festival of New Oil is known from other Qumran documents, including 4QCalendrical Document E and 4QMMT A. A wood offering for the temple in various forms found a wider currency in Second Temple Judaism, being mentioned in Josephus (War 2.425) and rabbinic literature (Meg. Ta'an. 4.5). Jubilees 21 discusses the types of wood appropriate for the temple sacrifices.

However, these lines of text from 4Q365 find their closest parallel in the Temple Scroll. The Temple Scroll also legislates for the festival of New Oil (cols. 11, 21-22, and 43); according to the Temple Scroll, the date of the festival is the 22nd day of the sixth month, right before the six-day Wood Festival. That date (or at least the proximity of the two festivals) seems to agree with 4Q365, frg. 23, which mentions the festival of New Oil in line 9, then goes on immediately to discuss the Wood Festival, also evidently a six-day festival (since lines io and ii mention the first and fourth days).

[Even more important are the parallels between these lines and cols. 23 and 24 of the Temple Scroll, which treat the Wood Festival. According to the Temple Scroll, the Wood Festival lasts for six days, from the 23rd to the 29th of the sixth month. This differs from the traditions of Nehemiah, Josephus, and the rabbis, but agrees with frg. 23, which envisions the tribes bringing the offering on consecutive days \(lines 9-11\). The most striking parallel between 4Q365 and the Temple Scroll is in fact in the order in which the tribes bring the offering. The Temple Scroll gives the following order: Levi and Judah on the first day, Benjamin and Joseph on the second, Reuben and Simeon on the third, Issachar and Zebulun on the fourth, Gad and Asher on the fifth, and Dan and Naphtali on the sixth day. In its complete form this tribal order is unique; it is not found elsewhere in extant Jewish literature. However, it does seem to be the same order found in fragmentary form on frg. 23: Levi on the first day and Reuben and Simeon on the third. This parallel between the Temple Scroll and 4Q365 led some scholars, beginning with Ygael Yadin, to include frg. 23 as part of a copy of the Temple Scroll.¹² However, as I have shown in a previous publication, although the contents of frg. 23 are a close parallel to the text of cols. 23-24 of the Temple Scroll, a detailed examination demonstrates that they are not copies of the same text.¹³ Rather, it is possible that 4Q365, frg. 23 contains material that served as a source for the author/redactor of the Temple Scroll.¹⁴ At the very least, frg. 23's overlap with the Temple Scroll demonstrates that the two documents are part of the same exegetical tradition. Further, that exegetical tradition carried authority with at least one group of Jews in the late Second Temple period, since other documents from Qumran \(4QCalendrical Document E, 4QMMT\) mention the festival of New Oil. This, as we shall see, is the strongest evidence for the scriptural authority of \(this manuscript of\) Reworked Pentateuch.](#)

We have been discussing the major instances of hyperexpansion in 4Q364 and 4Q365. There is, however, evidence of a more fragmentary nature that this type of scribal activity was widespread throughout the two manuscripts. For example, 4Q365, frg. 26a-b contains the end of the book of Leviticus and the beginning of the book of Numbers on the same fragment. This is part of the evidence for the claim that these manuscripts were copies of the entire Pentateuch. Line 1 contains the phrase "children of Israel," which is part of Lev 27:34, the last verse of Leviticus. Line 3 is a blank line; line 4 begins with Num 1:1. Therefore it is reasonable to conclude that this fragment represents the end of Leviticus and the beginning of Numbers. However, line 2 contains the remains of words that do not occur in the received text of Leviticus. Therefore, it is likely that frg. 26 contained an exegetical addition at the end of the book of Leviticus, even though we are unable to reconstruct it.

Other Examples of the Reworked Pentateuch Group: 4Q158

4Q364 and 4Q365 are the main exemplars of the group Reworked Pentateuch because they are the most extensively preserved. Other, smaller manuscripts fall into this category as well.

[4Q158 consists of 15 fragments which contain parts of Genesis and Exodus and two short passages from Deuteronomy. The date of the manuscript is the middle of the first century B.C.E. Although 4Q158 overlaps with other manuscripts in the Reworked Pentateuch group in several places, none of these overlaps indicate that 4Q158 is a direct copy of any of the others.¹⁵ Therefore, I prefer to think of 4Q158 as another member of the group Reworked Pentateuch rather than to speak of copies.¹⁶ The evidence for placing 4Q158 in this group is solid.](#)

4Q158 demonstrates many of the same features as 4Q364 and 4Q365. Some of the manuscript fragments of 4Q158 contain texts that do not differ substantially from the received text of Exodus, e.g., frgs. 5 (Exod 19:17-23) and 9 (Exod 21:15-25). Some

However, 4Q158 also moves beyond the pre-Samaritan group with the same kind of exegetical activity we have already observed in 4Q364 and 4Q365. 4Q158 interprets the received text according to its own exegetical principles. For example, Gen 32:25-32 (Jacob wrestling with the angel) and Exod 4:27-28 (Moses' meeting with Aaron when he returns from Midian) appear to be juxtaposed on frgs. 1-2. Here is the text of the fragments, beginning with Gen 32:30 in line 6:

6. . . . J[a]cob then asked him, "Please [te]ll me [your name]."
7. [And he bles]sed him there. And he said to him, "May the Lo[RD] make you fruitful [and multiply] you[...
8. [kn]owledge and understanding, and may he deliver you from all violence and[...
9. until this day and for everlast[ing] generations[. .
- io. And he walked on his way when he blessed him there. (32:31) And he called ...
- H. (32) to him the sun as he passed Penue [l ...
12. on that day, and he said to him, "You shall not e[at ...
13. (33) on the hip sockets to th[is day ...
14. (Exod 4:27) to Aaron, saying, "Go to mee [t ...
15. (28) the words of the LORD which he had s[ent] him, and all [the signs ...
16. the LORD to me, saying, "When you bring forth the[...
17. to go as slaves, and behold, they are thirt[ly ...
18. the LORD God[...
19. draw off[

The reason for this juxtaposition, seen in lines 13 and 14, is not entirely clear; unlike the other harmonizations we have studied, the juxtaposition of Genesis 32 and Exodus 4 does not seem to fill an interpretive gap in the text, nor do the texts at first glance seem to relate to the same topic. Further, these fragments in 4Q158 are not merely harmonistic, but also hyperexpansive. This is most clearly demonstrated in lines 7-10, which come at the end of Gen 32:30. These lines add new text containing the content of the angel's blessing of Jacob, not found in any other witness. The hyperexpansion fills an interpretive gap in the text, namely the contents of the angelic blessing. Like the Song of Miriam in 4Q365, this exegetical expansion borrows language from blessings found elsewhere in what became the biblical text, e.g. Gen 1:28; 17:6; 28:3, and the expansion functions in the same way.

Interestingly, it is possible that 4Q364 contained this same expansion. Frg. 5b, col. ii of 4Q364 contains the text of Gen 32:26-30. Line 13 contains the last letter of the word "there" (MV); it then continues with "and he sai[d]" (11)K1'1). This is the same word that begins the expansion in line 7 of 4Q158. Gen 32:31, on the other hand, begins with "and he called" (K17'1), found in 4Q158 on line 1o. Since 4Q158 and 4Q364 both contain the word "and he said" (1=11) at a point in the text where 4Q158 begins an expansion, it is entirely possible that 4Q364 contained the same expansion. If it did, this would be strong proof of a filial relationship between 4Q158 and 4Q364, more evidence that we are dealing with one single line of exegetical tradition. Unfortunately, 4Q364 breaks off at this point, so we cannot be certain.

The text following the expansion in lines 7-10 of 4Q158 gives further evidence of scribal exegesis. Lines 11-12 contain the text of Gen 32:31-32. Line 13 is similar in content to Gen 32:33, but the first extant phrase, "on that day" (~iK1~, 101'x), does not occur in the other witnesses to Genesis. The next section, beginning with "and he said," couches the prohibition of the consumption of the thigh sinew as a direct command rather than the indirect explanation found in the received text. The reason for these variations from the received text is not immediately apparent, except to make the alimentary prohibition direct and unmistakable. We also do not know whether or not these lines originated with the scribe of 4Q158.

Finally, although line 14 seems to indicate that 4Q158 has jumped to Exod 4:27 ("and the LORD said to Aaron..."), the following lines contain another reworked text. Lines 16-19 do not contain material found in the received text of Exodus, but rather contain a text which draws elements from Exodus 3. To illustrate, in line 16 Moses seems to be reporting to Aaron what God said to him in Exod 3:12, repeating the phrase "when you bring forth the people" (7.1 jf) Line 17 contains the phrase "to go as slaves," a reference to the Exodus, and contains the word "thirty" or "three," which may refer either to the length of the Israelites' sojourn in Egypt or to the three days' journey into the wilderness in Exod 3:18.18 Finally, line 19 contains the word "draw off," which occurs in the imperative in Exod 3:5, where God commands Moses to remove his sandals. All this information points to a reworked text, which again fills in an interpretive gap in the received text: when Exod 4:28 says that "Moses told Aaron all the words of the LORD ...," what did Moses say? 4Q158 answers the question by reconstructing Moses' encounter with God prior to meeting Aaron. This kind of harmonistic exegesis is

fragmentary. None of the preserved words coincide with either Gen 32:27, the verses that precede Gen 32:28 in the received text, or Exod 4:24-26, the passage that precedes Exod 4:27. We therefore cannot presume that our fragment contained a running text of Genesis with an interpolation from Exodus or a running text of Exodus with an interpolation from Genesis. The words "you have fought" (IV1W) on line 2 do occur in Gen 32:29 (the same words are not preserved in 4Q158, line 6). It is possible that lines 1-2 contain an exegetical expansion based on the following material, but it is impossible to be certain. Second, we are not certain of the context of the end of the fragment either. If the reworked text at the end of the fragment is meant to occur after Genesis 32, with Genesis 33 continuing afterward, then Moses and Aaron are introduced out of chronological sequence and the connection between the received texts and the expansion is ambiguous.

[There are two possibilities for understanding the sequence of passages. One is that the promise given to Jacob by the angel in the exegetical expansion in lines 7-10, that God would deliver his descendants from violence, is seen as fulfilled in the Exodus from Egypt, so that God's statement to Moses in Exodus 3 about the pending deliverance is paraphrased here out of sequence to indicate the fulfillment of the promise. The chronological difficulty mentioned above, however, remains. The second possibility for understanding the sequence is that the passage from Genesis has been inserted into Exodus \(rather than vice versa\), so that the Genesis pericope would follow the story of Moses' and Zipporah's encounter with \(the angel of\) God in Exod 4:24-26, a story that also involves the possibility of harm to the protagonist. This possibility of harm would be the exegetical "hook" that led the scribe to insert the Genesis story at this point in the Exodus narrative.¹⁹](#) The weakness of this second possibility is that there is no actual quotation or reworking of Exod 4:24-26 (as stated above), leaving the connection to be guessed at. Neither solution is entirely satisfactory; therefore, it must be said that the reason for the particular sequence of passages in frgs. 1-2 remains elusive.

[These two small fragments of 4Q158 contain all the characteristics of the group we call the Reworked Pentateuch texts. In fact, 4Q158 shows evidence of more extensive scribal exegesis than either 4Q364 or 4Q365, indicating that we could refine the spectrum of texts endlessly. For convenience, however, it is better to consider these texts as members of one group.²⁰](#)

We have examined three examples from the category Reworked Pentateuch texts. It is clear from this examination that these manuscripts belong in the scribal tradition that created the pre-Samaritan group of Pentateuch texts, with their primary trait of harmonization. However, these texts move beyond the pre-Samaritan group in their practice of exegesis by creating new material, additions which not only fill interpretive gaps in the received text, but also expand the text for theological reasons (i.e. 4Q365, frg. 23). Thus I have called these texts "hyperexpansive."

The Question of Authority

[We raised the question of the status and authority of these texts at the beginning of the chapter. Were these manuscripts considered as Scripture by any group of Jews, in particular the group at Qumran, at any point in time? Unfortunately we cannot be completely sure of the answer. If these texts \(especially 4Q364 and 4Q365, which were manuscripts of the entire Pentateuch when whole\) were considered simply as part of an ongoing tradition of exegesis of the Pentateuch, then these manuscripts were probably accepted as exemplars of the Five Books of Moses, carrying the full weight and authority of the Torah. This is the position of Eugene Ulrich, Michael Segal, Armin Lange, and now also Emanuel Tov.²¹ Arguments in favor of this position are, first, the fact that these manuscripts evidently present themselves in the same way as those manuscripts we now categorize as "biblical," that is, as regular Torah manuscripts. For example, the Tetragrammaton \(the consonants of the Divine Name YHWH\) is written in square script²², and there is no distinction made between new exegetical text and the received text, indicating that the entire text was meant to be considered part of the Torah. So we can say with almost complete certainty that 4Q364 and 4Q365 were meant by the scribes who prepared them to be read as regular pentateuchal texts. This is one of the criteria for scriptural status discussed in the Introduction above.²³ Second, the category has yielded several examples from the Qumran caves, indicating that this type of text was popular at least in the Qumran community. The number of copies is considered a weak indicator of scriptural status. Finally, there are suggestions that both 4Q364 and 4Q365 share a tradition of exegesis found in jubilees and the Temple Scroll. The question is raised, could 4Q364 have been a source for Jubilees, and/or 4Q365 for the Temple Scroll? If it could be shown without doubt that jubilees used 4Q364, frg. 3, col. ii \(the Isaac/Rebekah passage\) as a source, or that the Temple Scroll used 4Q365, frg. 23 \(the New Oil/Wood Festival passage\) as a source, then the argument for the authoritative status of these manuscripts would be greatly strengthened, since this would indicate community acceptance of a Reworked Pentateuch manuscript as authoritative. The evidence is unfortunately not definitive that either 4Q364 was used as a source by jubilees or 4Q365 by the Temple Scroll; the passages in question are not exact copies of one another, and there are several important differences. The most that can be said with certainty is that all these manuscripts shared a common tradition of exegesis, and that this tradition of exegesis was authoritative in and of itself, at least for those groups that embraced it. However, the evidence for the authoritative status of at least some of the manuscripts within the Reworked Pentateuch group in the community of Jews at Qumran is not certain, and becomes slimmer as the manuscripts become more fragmentary.²⁴ What is more, texts from the Reworked Pentateuch group do not continue to be copied; they do not survive the Great Jewish Revolt, and no single text from the group is canonized by any subsequent community. At the same time, the pesher genre, characterized by commentary separate from the received text, first appears in this same period, the first century B.C.E.²⁵ We may have in the Reworked Pentateuch group the end of a very long tradition of innerscriptural scribal exegesis, soon to be replaced by another tradition of separating the authoritative text from its commentary, a tradition that survives to our own day.](#)

The Reworked Pentateuch group contains the latest chronological examples of this tradition of scribal exegesis, in which the scribe's work did not result in a new composition. In the next examples along our spectrum of Rewritten Scripture works, jubilees and the Temple Scroll, the scribal redaction results in new compositions, clearly differentiated from the Pentateuch.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allegro, John M. "Biblical Paraphrase: Genesis, Exodus." In *Qumran Cave 4.1 (4Q158-4Q186)*, 1-6. DJD 5. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.
- Bernstein, Moshe. "What Happened to the Laws? The Treatment of the Legal Material in 4QReworked Pentateuch," DSD (forthcoming). I would like to thank Professor Bernstein for sharing his manuscript with me prior to publication.
- Brooke, George J. "4Qr58: Reworked Pentateuch A or Reworked Pentateuch A?" DSD 8 (2001) 219-41.
- "Power To the Powerless: A Long-Lost Song of Miriam." BAR 20/3 (1994) 62-65.
- . "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, 31-40. London: British Library and New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll, 2002.
- Crawford, Sidnie White. *The Temple Scroll and Related Texts. Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 2*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000.
- "Three Fragments from Qumran Cave 4 and Their Relationship to the Temple Scroll." JQR 85 (1994) 259-73.
- Falk, Daniel K. *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures Among the Dead Sea Scrolls*. LSTS 63. London: T. & T. Clark, 2007. This work appeared after my manuscript had reached the press, so I was unable to incorporate fully its conclusions in my work.
- Jastram, Nathan. "4QNumb. In Qumran Cave 4. VII: Genesis to Numbers, ed. Eugene Ulrich, Frank Moore Cross, et al., 205-68. DJD 12. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- Kim, Angela. "The Textual Alignment of the Tabernacle Sections of 4Q365." *Textus* 21 (2002) 45-69.
- Lange, Armin. "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 Toy, 21-30. London: British Library and New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll, 2002.
- Segal, Michael H. "Biblical Exegesis in 4Q158: Techniques and Genre." *Textus* 19 (1998) 45-62.
- "4QReworked Pentateuch or 4QPentateuch?" In *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam, 391-99. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000.
- Strugnell, John. "Notes en marge du Volume V des `Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan." RevQ 7 (1969-1970) 163-276.
- Tov, Emanuel. "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 C. Ulrich and James C. VanderKam, iii34. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.
- . "Reflections on the Many Forms of Hebrew Scripture in Light of the LXX and 4QReworked Pentateuch." In *From Qumran to Aleppo: A Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scriptures in Honor of His 65th Birthday*, ed. J. Zsengeller. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2008.
- , and Sidnie White (Crawford). "Reworked Pentateuch." In *Qumran Cave 4. V111.- Parabiblical Texts, Part i*, ed. Harold Attridge, T. Elgvin, et al., 187352. DJD 13. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- Ulrich, Eugene C. "The Qumran Scrolls and the Biblical Text." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam, 51-59. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000.
- Wise, Michael O. *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11*. SAOC 49. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.
- Yadin, Yigael. *Megillat ha-Miqdash (The Temple Scroll)*. 3 vols. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977; rev. Eng. ed., 1983.