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This dissertation provides a detailed analysis of the methods and goals that characterize the rewriting of Scripture in the 4QReworked Pentateuch (4QRP) manuscripts from Qumran (4Q158, 4Q364–367). It focuses first on determining the “compositional technique” used in each particular instance of departure from known textual versions—that is, the specific way in which the Vorlage was altered. Separately, an attempt is made to understand the interpretive processes leading to each change. The dissertation also includes a new text edition, with extensive notes, of 4Q158, the one 4QRP manuscript that did not previously exist in a satisfactory edition. 4Q158 provides the point of departure for the project and is examined in greatest detail. The investigation of 4Q158 and the other 4QRP manuscripts indicates that each is unique in terms of the compositional techniques employed and the purposes to which those techniques were put. The methods of reworking in the 4QRP manuscripts are then compared with those evidenced in two related texts or text groups: the Samaritan Pentateuch and its Qumranic forebears, and the Temple Scroll (11QT).
The Introduction and Conclusion contextualize this detailed analysis in the ongoing debate about the interrelationships between the various forms scriptural rewriting could take in Second Temple Jewish texts. Especially important in this regard is the ambiguous relationship between expanded versions of biblical books and texts that, while dependent upon Scripture for much of their structure and content, nevertheless constitute new, independent compositions. The 4QRP manuscripts occupy a prominent place in this debate because they seem to lie on the boundary between these two categories. The analysis conducted here provides empirical foundations for exploring issues that arise out of this discussion, such as the relationship between particular forms of reworking and particular exegetical goals; the connection between particular forms and purposes of reworking and the status of the resulting rewritten text; and the ways in which rewritten texts that constitute new compositions can be distinguished from expanded editions of biblical books. As such, it contributes to the understanding of an important stage in the development of the scriptural text and the history of exegesis.
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CHAPTER 1:
INTRODUCTION

The five Qumran manuscripts labeled 4QReworked Pentateuch (4Q158; 4Q364–367) have come to function in the last several years as a connecting link between two scholarly discourses that had previously been carried on largely independently of one another. On the one hand, the finds in the caves surrounding Khirbet Qumran had revolutionized the discussion of the textual history of the Hebrew Bible: nonsectarian, Hebrew manuscripts containing text types previously known only from the Samaritan or Greek versions—and others that departed from all known versions—indicated that the text of the Hebrew Bible was far from fixed in the final centuries before the turn of the millennium, but existed in a pluriformity scarcely imagined earlier. On the other hand, prompted by the discovery and publication of texts such as the Genesis Apocryphon and the Temple Scroll, other scholars were discussing the phenomenon of “rewritten Scripture,” in which Second Temple authors expressed exegetical and theological opinions by presenting a new version of scriptural narratives and laws.¹

¹ The term “rewritten Bible” was coined by Geza Vermes in 1961; Geza Vermes, Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies (2nd ed.; Studia Post-Biblica 4; Leiden: Brill, 1973). Since Vermes’s publication, there has been much debate over issues such as whether “rewritten Bible” constitutes a genre, a process, or a collection of loosely related texts; and which texts should be identified as “rewritten Bible.” For recent overviews, see Moshe J. Bernstein, "Rewritten Bible: A Generic Category Which Has Outlived its Usefulness?," Textus 22 (2005): 169-96; 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 (eds. Anthony
Onto the scene came the 4QRevised Pentateuch (4QRP) manuscripts in 1994, the year that 4Q364–367 were published in DJD 13.\(^2\) (4Q158 was published in DJD 5 by John Allegro, but had received virtually no attention.\(^3\)) These fragmentary manuscripts fit only uneasily into existing categories. On the one hand, they shared many features with texts classified as “rewritten Scripture”: they contained expansions, rearrangements, paraphrases, and other alterations of the received pentateuchal text. On the other hand, in some ways they seemed much closer to the pentateuchal text than any of the examples of “rewritten Scripture”: many fragments contained simply the text as known from elsewhere, with little or no variation. Unlike the Temple Scroll, Jubilees, or the Genesis Apocryphon, there was no hint of a new narrative setting: no new speaker or claim to constitute divine revelation. Therefore, although the official editors initially labeled the five 4QRP mss as copies of an extrabiblical interpretive composition (“rewritten Scripture”), other scholars, and ultimately the editors themselves, have argued that the manuscripts are in fact biblical manuscripts: versions of the Pentateuch expanded beyond what anyone had seen or thought possible before, but versions of the Pentateuch nonetheless.

---


\(^3\) John Allegro, Qumrân Cave 4, I (DJD 5; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 1-6.
In their position at this juncture between two discourses—which, rightly, have begun to merge—the 4QRP mss constitute critical evidence relevant to a number of issues. These include the status of the pentateuchal text in the late Second Temple period, the relationship (both intended and perceived) between “rewritten Scripture” texts and the Scriptures they rewrite, the nature of scribal activity in this period, and the history of exegesis. Yet the 4QRP mss have not been subjected to a thorough, detailed analysis from the point of view of how they rework the pentateuchal text. Such an analysis is necessary for a full understanding both of the manuscripts themselves and of their impact on the questions just mentioned. This analysis is the focal point of my project.

1.1 Background

The study and publication of what are now known as the five 4QRP mss began, as mentioned above, with Allegro’s edition of 4Q158, under the title 4QBiblical Paraphrase, in DJD 5 (1968). This edition, typical of those in DJD 5, is inexact and contains almost no commentary. Although Allegro’s desire to get the Scrolls published and into the hands of scholars as quickly as possible is admirable, one wonders whether the utter lack of contextualization was one reason the text received almost no attention for the next thirty years. In any case, the edition contains many errors, some but not all of which were noted...
by John Strugnell in a review article published in 1970.⁵ Because of the difficulties with
the existing edition, I have completely re-edited 4Q158 here, so as to provide a firm
textual basis for the analysis of its pentateuchal reworking (see section 1.3 below).

4Q158 began to receive more attention when it was identified by Emanuel Tov and
Sidnie White (Crawford) as another manuscript copy of the composition they had
labeled 4Q Reworked Pentateuch, extant in the four manuscripts 4Q364–367, which they
were editing for DJD 13. The editors characterized this composition as an interpretive
work which “contained a running text of the Pentateuch interspersed with exegetical
additions and omissions.”⁶ Although physical overlaps between the five manuscripts are
minimal, Tov and Crawford argued that they “share important characteristics” and
therefore should be regarded as multiple copies of a single composition.⁷

Two aspects in particular of Tov and Crawford’s characterization of the five
4QRP mss have drawn criticism from other scholars. First is the identification of the five
manuscripts as copies of a single composition. The few physical overlaps between the
manuscripts are so minor as to be virtually useless: in all of them the overlap occurs in a
section where the manuscripts are following the scriptural text closely, and there are only
two cases where the 4QRP mss share a unique reading against all other known witnesses.
They are very minor: 4Q364 17 3 and 4Q365 8a–b 1 both read ארון instead of את
ארון in Exod 26:34; and 4Q158 1–2 7 and 4Q364 5b ii 13 both read יאמר instead of
יקרא in

---

⁵ John Strugnell, "Notes en Marge du Volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of


Several scholars have argued that this is insufficient textual evidence for regarding the manuscripts as copies of the same composition, and have rejected the editors’ appeal to shared characteristics like exegetical additions and omissions as overly vague. Michael Segal and Moshe Bernstein both argue that the various manuscripts do not all deal with the scriptural text in the same way, and therefore the five manuscripts should not be regarded as copies of the same composition. George Brooke, taking a different approach, has shown that, in cases where there is an overlap or near-overlap between two fragments, they can almost never be reconstructed as having the same text. He therefore suggests that it would be more appropriate to refer to the five manuscripts as 4QRP A–E, indicating related but not identical compositions, than to regard them as copies of the same work, 4QRPa–e.

The other major point on which Tov and Crawford have been criticized is their characterization of 4QRP as an extrabiblical, non-authoritative text. Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam have both suggested that the types of exegetical changes evident in the 4QRP mss are precisely those that characterize the still-fluid biblical text in the Second Temple period. Michael Segal has espoused a variant form of this position,

---

8 Tov and White, DJD 13:188, 190. For more on this reading, see section 2.2.3 and n. 166 below.


arguing that 4Q364–367 most likely represent biblical texts, but that 4Q158 constitutes rewritten Scripture.  

In the past two years, both Tov and Crawford have changed their initial positions, such that both now accept the argument that the 4QRP mss may well represent expanded biblical texts. Tov argues in recent publications that the treatment of the biblical text in the 4QRP mss is so similar to what we find in expansive biblical texts like the Samaritan Pentateuch (SP) and some parts of the Septuagint (LXX) that 4QRP must be considered “Hebrew Scripture.” He notes that, if texts like the pre-SP manuscripts and the Hebrew Vorlagen for the LXX were considered authoritative Scripture, it is highly likely that 4QRP was considered authoritative as well. Crawford is somewhat more cautious. She acknowledges that at least some of the 4QRP mss “were meant by the scribes that prepared them to be read as regular pentateuchal texts,” but notes that we have little

---

12 Segal, "4Q Reworked Pentateuch," 394-95.

13 I use the term “pre-SP” throughout this dissertation to refer to those manuscripts that contain many of the same features as SP but lack the explicitly sectarian elements, such as the Samaritan version of the tenth commandment, prescribing worship upon Mt. Gerizim. A text similar to these pre-SP mss must have served as the Vorlage for SP, whose editor is now known to have made relatively minor changes to an existing Hebrew text-type. On this issue, see further in ch. 5 below. With the term “pre-SP” (instead of the older term “proto-SP”), I mean to indicate the textual affiliation of these mss with SP, without implying that there is anything specifically “Samaritan” about them.

14 Emanuel Tov, "Reflections on the Many Forms of Hebrew Scripture in Light of the LXX and 4QR Reworked Pentateuch," (IOSOT Congress Volume, Vienna, 2007 (forthcoming)). See also Emanuel Tov, "Three Strange Books of the LXX: 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions from Qumran and Elsewhere," in Die Septuaginta. Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten (eds. M. Karrer and W. Kraus; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007 (forthcoming)). Unlike Crawford, who accepts Brooke’s argument concerning the relation of the five manuscripts to one another, Tov nowhere in these newer articles addresses the issue of whether the 4QRP mss represent a single composition, and continues to talk about 4QRP as if it were a single text.
positive evidence that they were considered authoritative by any particular group.\textsuperscript{15} At the same time as Tov and Crawford have changed their positions, however, their original stance—that the 4QRP mss represent something other than copies of the Pentateuch—continues to find some support among scholars.\textsuperscript{16}

All this discussion has certainly advanced our understanding of the 4QRP mss, but several key issues remain insufficiently explored. For instance, Brooke has demonstrated convincingly on the basis of the physical evidence of the manuscripts that the five 4QRP mss should not be considered copies of the same work.\textsuperscript{17} But what of the claim of Bernstein and Segal, that qualitative differences in exegetical technique separate the manuscripts from one another? This claim has not been accompanied, as would seem necessary, by the detailed analysis of the techniques and purposes of scriptural reworking in the five manuscripts. Segal has published an article examining the techniques of 4Q158, but this has not been accompanied by a similar investigation of 4Q364–367.\textsuperscript{18} In general, although much has been made of the rewriting of Scripture that goes on in the


\textsuperscript{16} See especially Moshe J. Bernstein, "What Has Happened to the Laws? The Treatment of Legal Material in 4QReworked Pentateuch," \textit{DSD} 15 (2008): 24-49, at pp. 48-49. Especially because of the ways the 4QRP mss deal with legal material, including the possibility that major sections of biblical law were omitted, Bernstein hesitates to label any of the 4QRP mss as pentateuchal. He does, however, recognize the alternative as a possibility, and conceives that 4Q364 “might very well be” pentateuchal, because of its relatively conservative rewriting. (See further below.) For a similar assessment, which, however, lacks the nuance of Bernstein’s position, see Torleif Elgvin, "Sixty Years of Qumran Research: Implications for Biblical Studies," \textit{SEA} 73 (2008): 7-28, at p. 16.

\textsuperscript{17} See n. 10 above.

4QRP mss, treatment of this issue has been short on detail. Segal and Bernstein offer relatively in-depth analyses of the subsections that they treat in recent articles (Segal’s on 4Q158 and Bernstein’s on the legal material in all five mss). Yet two recent monographs focusing on texts that rewrite Scripture, each of which devotes a chapter to the 4QRP texts, address only a few of the most well-known additions and alterations, and shed little light on the full range of ways in which the manuscripts rewrite Scripture. Issues also arise in relation to the now quite popular position that the 4QRP mss represent copies of the Pentateuch.

1.2 A “Continuum” of Scriptural Reworking

The observation that there is a fundamental similarity between the textual reworking evident in some expanded copies of books of Scripture and that evident in the 4QRP mss is insightful and correct. However, that observation in itself does not prove that the 4QRP mss were simply copies of the Pentateuch. Instead, it leads to a host of related considerations.

Stress on the similarity between the methods of reworking in copies of biblical books and in 4QRP has been accompanied by the detection of essentially the same methods in other texts, texts which are usually categorized as rewritten Scripture (e.g. Jubilees, the Temple Scroll, the Genesis Apocryphon). This has led several scholars to

19 See above, nn 16 and 18.


21 For an in-depth consideration of whether the 4QRP mss can be identified conclusively as copies of the Pentateuch, see Molly M. Zahn, "The Problem of Characterizing the 4Q Reworked Pentateuch Manuscripts: Bible, Rewritten Bible, or None of the Above?", *DSD* 15 (2008): 315-39.
postulate the existence of a sort of “continuum” or “spectrum” upon which the various texts that rework Scripture can be plotted, from texts that depart relatively infrequently and in more minor ways from the scriptural text as known from elsewhere to those that make frequent, major changes. Thus, for the Pentateuch, the pre-SP texts from Qumran and SP itself, with their relatively restrained changes, would be close to one end of the continuum, the 4QRP mss would be somewhat farther along, Jubilees and the Temple Scroll farther along still, and texts like the Genesis Apocryphon close to the other end.

Anyone with even a casual familiarity with the contents of these texts is likely to perceive the intuitive appeal of such a continuum. While its heuristic value is clear, however, this model also presents some problems. To begin with, the intuitive plotting of points along the spectrum has not been accompanied by the kind of study that would provide empirical support. Such study would involve a thorough examination of the ways in which each text reworks Scripture, and then a comparison of the texts in order to determine the similarities and differences between them. For most of the texts mentioned above (especially SP and the 4QRP mss), a full study of their methods of reworking Scripture is still lacking. Even the one text that has been studied more thoroughly from

---

22 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* (eds. Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov; London: British Library, 2002), 31–40; VanderKam, "Wording of Biblical Citations," 46; VanderKam, "Questions of Canon," 99, 108; Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*. The idea of a continuum of reworking seems to be endorsed more implicitly by Petersen, "Rewritten Bible." It should be emphasized that Brooke and VanderKam do not explore the idea at length. Crawford, on the other hand, returns to the concept at several points (see n. 26 below).

23 Sanderson’s study of the textual traditions of the book of Exodus, based on 4QpaleoExod	extsuperscript{m}, includes a thorough analysis of the texts of MT, G, SP, and 4QpaleoExod	extsuperscript{m}. The limitation is that she examines only sections of Exodus where 4QpaleoExod	extsuperscript{m} is actually extant. See Judith E. Sanderson, *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran: 4QpaleoExod	extsuperscript{m} and the Samaritan Tradition* (HSS 30; Atlanta: Scholars, 1986). See also Raphael Weiss, "היוולפ לשמעת רדסיים במקרא והמשורר בעה מקרא השופריא על תחתיה," in *Studies in the Text and Language of the Bible* (Jerusalem: Magness, 1970), 63-189. As the title indicates,
this perspective, the Temple Scroll (TS), has not been compared in any systematic way to other texts on the spectrum. I submit that we still lack an accurate understanding of the methods by which Scripture was reworked in the late Second Temple period, of the relation between those methods and the particular theological or exegetical issues addressed by a given reworking, and of how to measure or evaluate appropriately the

Weiss focuses on “synonymous variants” in SP (substitution of one word or phrase for another), many of which may not represent deliberate change on the part of the SP editors. Weiss, of course, was working without access to the Qumran pre-SP mss. To my knowledge there has been no other contemporary study of textual reworking in SP and the pre-SP mss. Segal and Bernstein (see n. 19 above) offer the most in-depth studies of the 4QRP mss, but these are still only partial. The Genesis Apocryphon, similarly, remains to be studied comprehensively from the point of view of its reworking of Scripture. Two partial treatments can be mentioned, however: Fitzmyer includes in the introduction to his edition an analysis of the scroll’s relation to the text of Genesis for the portions that are more “targumic” (cols 19–22), and Bernstein has drawn attention to cases of “harmonistic” editing that resemble those found in the Samaritan Pentateuch. See Joseph A. Fitzmyer, The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20): A Commentary (3d ed.; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 2004), 40-43; Moshe J. Bernstein, "Re-Arrangement, Anticipation and Harmonization as Exegetical Features in the Genesis Apocryphon," DSD 3 (1996): 37-57. Jacques van Ruiten has now provided compositional analysis for the portions of the book of Jubilees that rewrite Genesis 1–11 as well as several smaller pericopes; see J.T.A.G.M. van Ruiten, "The Rewriting of Exodus 24:12-18 in Jubilees 1:1-4," BN 79 (1995): 25-29; J.T.A.G.M. van Ruiten, "The Relationship Between Exod 31,12-17 and Jubilees 2,1.17-33," in Studies in the Book of Exodus: Redaction--Reception--Interpretation (ed. Marc Vervenne; BETL 126; Leuven: Peeters, 1996), 567-75; J.T.A.G.M. van Ruiten, Primaevael History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis 1-11 in the book of Jubilees (JSISup 66; Leiden: Brill, 2000). The studies of biblical interpretation in Jubilees by Endres and VanderKam focus primarily on interpretive method, but do make mention of some rewriting methods as well (for the distinction, see section 1.3.1 below): John C. Endres, Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees (CBQMS 18; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association, 1987), 196-225; James C. VanderKam, "Biblical Interpretation in 1 Enoch and Jubilees," in The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation (eds. James H. Charlesworth and C.A. Evans; JSPSup 14; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 96-125.

24 Yadin’s editio princeps contains an impressive amount of commentary on the text as well as his famous list of five “forms of editing” found in TS: “formulating the text in the first person,” “merging commands on the same subject,” “unifying duplicate commands,” “modifications and additions” for halakhic clarification, and “appending whole new sections”; see Yigael Yadin, The Temple Scroll (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977-83), 1.71-88. Michael Wise includes a full compositional analysis of the Temple Scroll, where he divides the Scroll’s various ways of rewriting Scripture into eleven different categories, as an appendix to his monograph; Michael Owen Wise, A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11 (SAOC 49; Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1990), 205-42. Dwight Swanson, on the other hand, makes the Scroll’s treatment of Scripture the focal point of his study, and provides a very detailed analysis of major portions of the Temple Scroll. Swanson’s classification system is totally different from Wise’s (and Yadin’s): he attempts to fit scriptural reuse in every part of TS into the model of a single “base text” combined with a “secondary text” and nuanced by allusion to “supplementary texts”; Dwight D. Swanson, The Temple Scroll and the Bible: The Methodology of 11QT (STDJ 14; Leiden: Brill, 1995).
distance of a given work from its scriptural source text. A sustained comparative investigation is necessary to answer these questions.

Second, insufficient attention has been paid to the question of how the idea of the continuum relates to the problem—most salient for the 4QRP mss—of determining whether a work was intended as “biblical”; that is, as a copy or new edition of a biblical book, or as “rewritten Scripture”: a new work that draws on the Bible. In her new monograph, Crawford repeatedly notes that there is a point on the spectrum “in which the scribal manipulation of the base text is so extensive that a recognizably new work is created.” In this conception, which others also appear to share at least at some level, there is a quantity of change or difference from the known scriptural text beyond which a work can no longer be considered “Bible” and must be termed “rewritten Bible” (or “rewritten Scripture”). Again, this position makes intuitive sense, but lacks precision: how much difference is “too much”? Does the type of difference matter? Michael Segal has argued persuasively that it is not the sheer amount of difference from the base text

25 Generally I agree that the terms “Scripture” and “scriptural” are more appropriate than “Bible” and “biblical” in reference to texts of the Second Temple period, since there was no fixed canon of Scripture at this point and the forms of the particular books that were later included in the Bible were still somewhat fluid (see further below). However, the term “scriptural” becomes problematic in discussions about whether a particular manuscript represents a copy or edition of a book that later became part of the Bible, because even a rewritten text that is intended as a new literary work (like Jubilees or the Temple Scroll) may have been “scriptural” in the sense of having authority and/or being regarded as sacred. The term “scriptural” does not get at the literary issue of whether a rewritten work should be considered a copy of the book or books it rewrites or a new work altogether. Therefore, I occasionally use the term “biblical” to refer to a copy or edition of a book that later became part of the Bible. The term should not be taken to imply anything about the status of the canon in the last two centuries BCE. For a fuller explanation of the issues, see Zahn, "4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts," 317-19.

26 Crawford, Rewriting Scripture, 14. See also p. 62 and especially p. 86: “[T]hey [sc. TS and Jubilees] have both departed from their pentateuchal base texts far enough to be termed separate works.” (My emphasis.)

27 Both Moshe Bernstein and, following him, James VanderKam speak of a “border” (albeit poorly marked) “between biblical texts and biblical interpretation”; Bernstein, "Pentateuchal Interpretation at Qumran," 134. See also VanderKam, "Wording of Biblical Citations," 46.
that qualifies a work as “rewritten Scripture,” but rather specific types of changes: a new narrative setting, a new speaker, a new scope. In his view, ancient editors used specific literary techniques in order to indicate to the reader that, despite sometimes pervasive reuse of a biblical source, their work was not intended as a copy or new edition of the book(s) they rewrote, but as a new literary entity.28

This distinction between quantity of difference and quality of difference is critical to a proper understanding of the 4QRP mss, as well as other similar works. If we classify the 4QRP mss as copies of the Pentateuch, it should not be because of their closeness to the pentateuchal text relative to other works, but because there is no literary or formal indication that they are anything other than pentateuchal. Conversely, if we classify the Temple Scroll or Jubilees as non-biblical (though quite probably scriptural!) compositions, it should not be because of the amount of difference between them and the text of the Pentateuch, but because each has been given a new literary setting and a new literary voice: both are set at the top of Mt. Sinai; in the Temple Scroll, God speaks to Moses directly; in Jubilees, the divine word is mediated through the Angel of the Presence.29

Thus while the idea of a continuum or spectrum of scriptural reworking is a helpful one, it has yet to be fully fleshed out. Besides a fuller investigation of the texts involved so as to plot more accurately the points on this continuum, more consideration is needed of the relationship between methods of reworking and the intended status of the


29 See Segal, "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible," 21-23.
resulting composition. The previous paragraph indicates that we cannot simply draw a line on a quantitative scale beyond which it is no longer possible for a rewritten text to be considered a copy of a biblical book. However, this does not mean that there is no connection between the methods by which a text reworks Scripture and the status intended for that text. Perhaps particular types of changes occur with particular frequency in particular types of works; perhaps there is no correlation. Part of my task in what follows will be to gather the data to attempt an answer to these questions.

1.3 The Approach of This Dissertation

In what follows I will begin to address some of the difficulties noted above. The main part of the dissertation consists of a detailed analysis of the ways Scripture is reworked in the 4QRP mss (chs 3, 4) and a comparison of the techniques found there with those evidenced by the Samaritan Pentateuch and the pre-Samaritan texts from Qumran on the one hand (ch. 5), and by the Temple Scroll on the other (ch. 6). I will focus primarily on the details and method of the reworking itself—what I call “compositional technique”—but will also consider the motivation behind particular changes—the interpretive decision(s) that led the author to make a given change.\(^{30}\) As mentioned, I will begin the dissertation with a complete new text edition of 4Q158, the one 4QRP manuscript that was not published by Tov and Crawford. The edition and the extensive commentary that accompanies it (ch. 2) make 4Q158 the focal point and jumping-off point for this study. This serves my larger project well for two reasons. First,

\(^{30}\) For clarification of the term “compositional technique” and the reasons for separating textual reworking per se from the interpretive processes underlying it, see section 1.3.1 below.
a thorough textual analysis of the other 4QRP manuscripts is available in the DJD 13 edition; since Allegro’s edition lacked such analysis it is appropriate that I give 4Q158 more attention here. Second, the length of the other 4QRP mss, 4Q364 and 4Q365 in particular, precludes a detailed discussion of each and every fragment, though I do comment on every instance of substantial difference from known versions in 4Q364–367 where the text is extant enough to allow for analysis.\textsuperscript{31} The more detailed attention to 4Q158 in a way allows it to serve as a representative example that can then function as a point of comparison in my analysis of the other 4QRP mss.

Because the focus of my project is on the methods and goals of textual reworking in the 4QRP mss, I will pay relatively little attention to the question of whether the 4QRP mss are copies of the Pentateuch or represent new compositions, though I will return to this issue in the Conclusion. In the current state of research, I do not believe a definitive decision can be made regarding the status of these texts.\textsuperscript{32} However, I find the literary features mentioned above—the fact that the 4QRP mss preserve no voice or setting different from that of the Pentateuch—quite compelling evidence that these mss were originally copies of the Pentateuch. This assessment requires more research and consideration, but in light of the work that has been done to date I am inclined to regard the 4QRP mss as most likely pentateuchal.\textsuperscript{33}

\textsuperscript{31} A complete list of all extant instances of reworking in the 4QRP mss is included in the Appendix.

\textsuperscript{32} For the reasoning behind this claim, see Zahn, "4Q Reworked Pentateuch Manuscripts."

\textsuperscript{33} For some suggestions regarding the direction future research might take in order to answer this question more definitively, see below, in the Conclusion, section 7.2.3.
1.3.1 Compositional Technique and Exegesis

I use the term “compositional technique” to refer to the procedure by which a given verse or pericope is reworked in the texts I examine. A compositional technique is a specific way of manipulating or altering the base text, such as addition of new text, rearrangement, or paraphrase. Below, I will lay out a basic typology of compositional techniques, which I will employ in my analysis of the 4QRP mss, the pre-SP texts and SP, and the Temple Scroll. First, however, it is necessary to distinguish “compositional technique” from the terms “exegesis” and “exegetical technique,” which have often been used in its stead.

Scholars of rewritten Scripture frequently refer to alterations of the scriptural source as “exegesis” and the various methods by which this is accomplished as “exegetical techniques.” This terminology, however, conflates two different aspects of textual rewriting: the decision that a text should say something other than what it currently says—an act of interpretation—and the reformulation of the text to reflect that interpretation. The interpretive decision as to what a text means is fundamentally different from the decision to present that interpretation in a particular way. This can be seen most clearly from cases where the same interpretive decision is presented in multiple ways. For example, both the Damascus Document (CD) and the Temple Scroll

---


35 A rare instance in which this distinction is recognized explicitly is Moshe J. Bernstein and Shlomo A. Koyfman, "The Interpretation of Biblical Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Forms and Methods," in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. Matthias Henze; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 61-87, at pp. 65-66. Bernstein and Koyfman distinguish between the “form” of interpretation—“the way the interpretation is articulated”—and the “method” of interpretation—“the way the interpretation is arrived at.”
condemn the marriage of a niece and her uncle. Doubtless this opinion was reached through reflection on the biblical laws on forbidden marriages, perhaps in light of the situation pertaining in the reader’s own community—that is, the decision was reached through exegesis. Yet the same interpretation is presented differently in each text. CD uses the form of lemma + comment: after referring to Lev 18:13, which forbids intercourse between a nephew and his aunt, the author remarks, “Now the law of forbidden unions is written for [i.e. from the perspective of] males, but like them are the women” (CD 5:9–10). The Temple Scroll, on the other hand, simply constructs an analogous law: “A man shall not take the daughter of his brother or the daughter of his sister, for it is an abomination” (11QT 66:16–17). The opinion and by all likelihood the interpretive reasoning are the same, but the presentation is totally different. Therefore, instead of referring to both interpretation and presentation as “exegesis,” I would restrict this term to the former process only: the interpretation of a text; the process of coming to a decision about the meaning of the text. “Exegetical technique” would then refer to the means by which such decisions are reached. (Rabbinic hermeneutical principles such as gezera shava and qal wa-homer in my mind constitute exegetical techniques.) The method by which one chooses to present one’s interpretation is what I have chosen to refer to as “compositional technique.”

This distinction between compositional technique and exegesis is not simply a terminological quibble. It is necessary for a proper understanding of the texts, because interpretation (exegesis) and rewriting are not the same procedure, and we use different tools to recognize them. Compositional techniques can be identified by comparison of the rewritten text with its scriptural source; that is, by a fairly empirical process, while
determining the exegetical or theological purpose behind a particular change is a much more subjective procedure, involving judgements about the concerns or goals of the author. Mixing the two categories blends two steps into one: the identification of the author’s concern or problem, and the identification of the means used by the author to address the concern. It risks creating the impression that a particular hermeneutical issue is only addressed compositionally in one particular way. More often, the categorization of a particular change in terms of the exegesis behind it means that the compositional technique by which a change is made is left unaddressed.

A brief example will clarify what I mean. Michael Wise presents a full “compositional analysis” of the Temple Scroll in his 1990 monograph, in which he analyzes the text’s relationship to the biblical source according to categories such as “verbatim quotation,” “paraphrase,” and “free composition.” These categories do reflect

36 By shifting the terms slightly to speak of “exegetical or theological purpose,” I am consciously implying an overlap or ambiguity between the exegetical and the theological. On the one hand, I wish to avoid the impression that all changes in a rewritten text stem from what has sometimes been referred to as “pure exegesis”—ostensibly a straightforward attempt to respond to a perceived difficulty in the text. Many changes in rewritten texts reflect ideological positions that may or may not have any connection to the particular passage in which the change occurs. On the other hand, even changes that do not seem to spring directly from reflection upon the text at hand often do respond to some feature of the base text—something in the text provides the “exegetical stimulus,” as Kugel puts it, for a change that may do much more than simply interpret or clarify the text at hand. Therefore, “ideological” or “theological” changes in rewritten texts (sometimes referred to as “applied exegesis”) cannot really be distinguished from “exegetical” ones. See James L. Kugel, Traditions of the Bible (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998), 21-22. For a similar point pertaining to the pentateuchal Targumim, see Alexander Samely, The Interpretation of Speech in the Pentateuch Targums: A Study of Method and Presentation in Targumic Exegesis (Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 27; Tübingen: Mohr, 1992), 82-85. For the terms “pure” and “applied” exegesis, see Geza Vermes, "Bible and Midrash: Early Old Testament Exegesis," in Post-Biblical Jewish Studies (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 59-91.

37 This constitutes one of the major difficulties I have with Crawford’s analysis of the 4QRP mss in her new monograph on rewritten Scripture. She labels a number of changes in 4Q364, 4Q365, and 4Q158 “harmonistic changes”—that is, changes that do not involve brand-new, non-pentateuchal material. One could debate Crawford’s definition of “harmonistic,” which seems overly broad (on this issue, see further below, section 5.2). Even more problematic from my perspective, however, is the lack of indication that these “harmonistic changes” in fact represent two or three different compositional techniques. See Crawford, Rewriting Scripture, 40-46.
compositional techniques. However, Wise also includes the categories “midrashic usage” and “halakhic exegesis.”

Thus he labels 11QT 43:12b a “halakhic exegesis” of Deut 14:24b, which allows those who live at a great distance from the Temple to convert their tithes into money and buy equivalent meat and produce upon arrival at the Temple, instead of bringing their own. Wise’s assessment is undoubtedly correct from an exegetical perspective: TS interprets Deuteronomy’s inexact phrase "if the place is too far from you," by defining the distance beyond which one could convert tithes as a three-days’ journey from the Temple. This certainly qualifies as halakhic exegesis. But this label indicates nothing about the actual form in which TS presents its interpretation. The author could have cited Deut 14:24b verbatim, for instance, and then simply added a modifier, such as "if the place…is at a distance from you of a three-days’ journey...". Instead, the author presents the law by means of the compositional technique of paraphrase, recasting it from the second person to the third person and removing Deuteronomy’s oblique reference to the Temple as "the place":

Wise’s language accurately identifies the exegetical procedure behind the change, but does not account for the particular textual form in which TS presents its exegesis. For a full understanding of works that rewrite Scripture, both aspects—the compositional and the exegetical—must be taken into account.

---

38 For the full list of categories, see Wise, Critical Study, 208.
One final comment is necessary. Although I have stressed the need to keep identification of compositional technique separate from identification of exegetical purpose, and noted that compositional technique can be deduced from the text while determining exegetical purpose usually requires a broader understanding of the aims of the author/editor, the two procedures are not entirely independent. Of course determining the motivation for a given deviation from the source text requires analysis of the rewritten text in its specific form. Conversely, and perhaps less obviously, the basic judgement that a given variation between a rewritten text and its scriptural source constitutes a modification by the rewriter, as opposed to a later alteration on the part of the source, often depends upon the detection of an exegetical or theological purpose that would explain why someone would want to change the text in the first place. Since we know that the pentateuchal text was still in flux in the late Second Temple period, it is fallacious to assume that every difference between a rewritten text and the Masoretic Text (or any other extant version) is the result of a deliberate change by the author of the rewritten text. More will be said about this below. In this context it is important to note that, especially in the context of smaller additions or alterations, identifying a plausible exegetical motive is often a prerequisite to being able to classify a variant compositionally as an addition, alteration, etc. Thus, even though compositional technique and exegetical purpose should be investigated separately, they cannot be studied in isolation from one another.
1.3.2 The Categories of Compositional Technique Used in This Study

One of the difficulties with previous detailed studies of methods of reworking in Second Temple texts is that each has focused on a single text, or a section thereof, and has used its own system of categories and terminology. The profusion of terminological systems naturally complicates any attempt to compare the techniques used in different texts. I have therefore tried to develop as flexible a system of categories as possible, one that will allow for precise description of all the texts I will discuss and facilitate easy comparison. I also hope to extend it in the future to texts that I cannot address as a part of this project.

I have chosen to begin from the three most basic categories of changes that can be made to a source text: additions, omissions, and alterations. Models for this type of categorization can be found in Judith Sanderson’s analysis of 4QpaleoExod$^m$ and in the work of Jacques van Ruiten on Jubilees.\textsuperscript{39} Much descriptive work can be accomplished simply by categorizing changes according to one of the three above categories and according to their size (e.g. large additions, small additions, small alterations, etc.). However, some further precision is necessary, so I have developed the following subcategories:

A. Additions

A.1. Addition of New Material: This category will cover what we most readily think of as “addition”: the insertion of new material not attested elsewhere in the Pentateuch.

\textsuperscript{39} See n. 23 above.
A.2. Addition of Material from Elsewhere: To this category belong additions that
derive their content and formulation from another scriptural text (almost exclusively from
the Pentateuch in the texts I will examine). The source of the addition is not transposed,
deleted, or otherwise disturbed but remains “intact” in its original location (in contrast to
rearrangement; see below). The Samaritan Pentateuch contains many examples of this
technique, one of which also occurs in 4Q158: the addition of parallel material from
Deuteronomy 5 and 18 into the Priestly version of the Decalogue in Exodus 20.

B. Omissions.

C. Alterations

C.1. Minor Alterations: In this category I include small-scale changes, usually the
use of a different form of a word or the replacement of one or two words with other
words. An example is the change evident at Gen 2:2 in SP (and LXX), which reads ויכל
הששי ביום אלהים, “God finished on the sixth day…” for MT ויכל אלהים ביה השби
יום, “God finished on the seventh day.”

C.2. Rearrangements: This category refers to instances where a pentateuchal text
is actually removed from its context in known versions and put in a new position in the
rewritten text; that is, the sequence of the pentateuchal text is changed.

C.3. Paraphrase: In a way, this is rewriting in the most literal sense of the word.
Paraphrase reflects the same content as the source passage, and may incorporate some of
its significant terms, but otherwise is formulated differently. It involves saying the same

40 This example comes from Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2nd ed.;
Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 92.
thing in different words. Technically, paraphrase usually consists of a series of small
additions, omissions, alterations, and rearrangements.

C.4. Replacement with Material from Elsewhere: This category involves the
insertion of material from elsewhere into a new context, as in the category Addition of
Material from Elsewhere. It differs, however, in that some text in the new location is
omitted in the course of the insertion. That is, it resembles a minor alteration, where one
word is replaced with another, except on a larger scale, and with the requirement that the
replacement derive from another scriptural text.

These categories will be combined with observation of the size and frequency of
particular types of changes; thus for example, addition of new material could occur in a
given text frequently, rarely, or not at all, and such additions could be large, moderate, or
minor. Charting along these various “axes” (compositional technique, size, frequency)
allows for a fairly nuanced description of the reworking in each particular text, while also
allowing for easy comparison.

1.3.3 Identifying Changes against the Background of a Fluid Text

I referred earlier to the difficulty of identifying deliberate changes to a
pentateuchal text that was still in a state of constant flux. One cannot simply compare a
given rewritten text to the MT’s textus receptus (or, for that matter, to other early
versions such as LXX) and take for granted that the MT (or LXX) reading constitutes the
earliest form in every case. We must constantly keep in mind the possibility that the
rewritten texts might preserve readings that are in fact earlier than those preserved in
more well-known versions. 41

Given that caveat, however, it is fair to say that in most cases a decision about the
relative lateness of a given change is relatively straightforward. Major variants that are
not attested in any other textual witness are unlikely to be early: if they were, it would be
surprising that they were not preserved in any other version. 42 If there is evidence that the
variants improve the text by filling in gaps or resolving exegetical issues, then their
relative lateness is even more probable. Since nearly all of the major variants I will be
discussing fulfill one if not both of these criteria, I will generally presume that they
represent secondary changes to the shorter base text represented by MT and (usually) G.
This procedure is not entirely defensible from a methodological perspective—ideally
each variant would be assessed on its own terms—but is necessary for practical purposes:
it would take many more pages than is conscionable to defend the lateness of every
variant individually, especially since the arguments are much the same in each case.

41 Related to this point, a terminological clarification is necessary regarding my use of the label
“Masoretic Text.” Technically, this term refers to the medieval form of the Hebrew text that included
the work of the Masoretes. However, the fact that many of the copies of biblical books found in the Judean
desert match the consonantal text of the MT very, very closely indicates that the medieval MT reflects a
text type current in the Second Temple period. For this reason, I will generally use the term MT loosely, to
refer to this earlier text type, with the understanding that a slight anachronism is involved. On the early date
of the consonantal text of MT, see Tov, Textual Criticism, 22-39, especially 27-30.

42 There is one case that suggests this rule may not be ironclad: One of the manuscripts of Samuel
discovered at Qumran, 4QSam 1, preserves a paragraph that is absent in all other versions. While Rofé has
argued that the plus is a later addition, Cross and others present evidence (which I am inclined to accept)
that the plus was original and dropped out of most manuscript traditions due to haplography. See Frank
Moore Cross, "The Ammonite Oppression of the Tribes of Gad and Reuben: Missing Verses from 1
Samuel 11 found in 4QSamuel," in History, Historiography and Interpretation (eds. H. Tadmor and M.
Weinfield; Jerusalem: Magness, 1983), 148-58; Alexander Rofé, "4QMidrash Samuel?--Observations
Concerning the Character of 4QSam," Textus 19 (1998): 63-74. In this case, then, a unique reading may in
fact be original, against what seems to be the general trend. However, the paragraph is not totally unique: it
is referred to by Josephus, who must have had a form of it in the text of Samuel that he used; Cross,
Minor variants are a different story. Additions and changes pertaining to single words are so ubiquitous in the transmission of the pentateuchal text that it is much harder to be certain about the secondary nature of any one particular variant in a rewritten text: in many cases, the change might just as easily have occurred at a later stage in the transmission of the pentateuchal text. Even for minor variants, it is often easy to detect a clarificatory or exegetical purpose that suggests relative lateness. Therefore I do discuss a number of minor variants as illustrative of the compositional techniques present in a given work. However, my assessments concerning these minor changes should be taken as less certain than those pertaining to major variants, since it is much more difficult to be confident that a given variation represents deliberate change.

Another issue pertaining to the fluid nature of the Pentateuch in this period emerges even in cases where the relative lateness of a variant is somewhat clear. That reading still may have originated at an earlier stage in transmission than the rewritten work it now appears in; that is, it may have appeared in the author/editor’s Vorlage. This in turn raises another tricky question which will recur throughout the following chapters: who is “the editor” and what constitutes “the Vorlage”? What evidence is there for regarding the 4QRP mss, the various texts related to SP, and TS as products of one primary editorial hand, as opposed to texts that evolved gradually over time through the work of many redactors?

I deal with this question and the types of evidence that might help answer it in section 2.2 below. For now, two points are sufficient. First, I am only concerned in what follows with unique variants. I generally do not discuss readings found in the 4QRP mss or TS that are shared with MT, G, or SP, nor readings in the pre-SP manuscripts or SP
that are shared with MT or G.\textsuperscript{43} Because they occur in multiple independent witnesses, I presume that these readings did not originate with the texts I am looking at, and therefore do not contribute to an understanding of how Scripture is reworked in those texts.

Second, I do not assume that each text I will be looking at is the product of a single editorial hand. As will be discussed below, there is little evidence for and a fair amount of evidence against such a presumption. Rather, I take each text as a (different) witness to the types of rewriting that took place in the Second Temple period. The question of whether this rewriting occurred gradually or all at once is considered separately.

\textsuperscript{43} In using MT, G, and SP as the standards to which readings are compared, I do not mean to privilege these particular text-types or grant them some kind of normative status in the history of the pentateuchal text. Rather, these texts are the touchstones because they are the only full texts of the Pentateuch that we possess, apart from later translations. While it must be recognized that e.g. MT represents simply one form of the Pentateuch among other forms current in the Second Temple period, in practice we must make use of the texts that we have, and this means using complete versions of the Pentateuch as points of reference for analysis of fragmentary texts like those found at Qumran.
CHAPTER 2:
EDITION OF 4Q158

2.1 Overview

2.1.1 Physical Description

4Q158 consists of fifteen numbered fragments. The largest, frag. 1, measures 93 mm at its longest point by 65 mm at its widest; the smallest, frag. 15, measures 10 mm x 7 mm. Several of the fragments (4, 9, 11) have broken into two pieces. Two additional fragments, originally not included as part of 4Q158, were identified by John Strugnell as belonging with frag. 14. Since the two additional fragments are contiguous, I refer to them together as frag. 14a.

The text is written on leather that ranges in color from light brown (frag. 5, frag. 7) to dark brown (frag. 6). Frag. 13 is somewhat more reddish than the others, a fact that may carry some significance in assessing the relationship of this fragment to the others. Almost all of the fragments contain very dark areas due to deterioration of the leather, the darkest being frag. 2, frag. 4, frag. 6, frag. 9, and frag. 15. Some lighter areas on the leather also appear to be due to damage: fragments 1 and 11 contain some whitish spots, and fragments 3 and 6 have some light patches that do not appear to be the original color of the leather. Other types of damage—creases, cracks, and flaking or crumbling of the leather—occur on every fragment. Fragments 4, 6, 11, and 14 are especially damaged.
2.1.2 Contents

4Q158 contains material primarily from the book of Exodus, with some material from Genesis and Deuteronomy and some material not otherwise attested in the biblical tradition. The following table illustrates the biblical contents of the manuscript; it should be kept in mind that many of the fragments contain new material as well. More detail can be found in the discussion of each individual fragment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fragment</th>
<th>Biblical References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frag. 1–2</td>
<td>Gen 32:25–33 + Exod 4:27–28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag. 3</td>
<td>Gen 47:29–30? (paraphrase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag. 4</td>
<td>Exod 3:12 + 24:4–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag. 5</td>
<td>Exod 19:17–23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag. 6</td>
<td>Exod 20:19–21 (SP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag. 7–9</td>
<td>Exod 20:12–17, 21b (SP)–21:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag. 13</td>
<td>Exod 30:32–34?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag. 14</td>
<td>Related to Exod 6:3–8; 15:1–20?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frag. 15</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.3 Columns and Line-lengths

None of the fragments of 4Q158 preserves the entire width or length of a column. Nevertheless, in cases where the text apparently adheres to the pentateuchal text as

44 As will become clear below, I do not think the numbering of the fragments accurately reflects their sequence in terms of content. Frag. 1–2 probably belongs in Exodus 4, thus probably after frag. 3, while frag. 4 almost certainly belongs in Exodus 24, thus between frag. 10–12 and frag. 13. I have chosen not to re-number (or re-sequence) the fragments partially for the sake of clarity, but also because the proper pentateuchal location of several fragments (e.g. frag. 3, frag. 14) is uncertain.
known from elsewhere, an estimate of the number of letter-spaces per column can be determined.

I have used my transcription and reconstruction as the basis for my counts, except in cases where I have introduced extra space between words in order to reflect the spacing of the manuscript more accurately. In these instances, I have gone back to the photographs and estimated how many letters of average width could fit in the empty space. I have not as a rule introduced extra spaces in the reconstructed portions of the text, unless they were necessary to maintain the proper spacing of the extant text; where I have inserted extra spaces, I have not counted them in calculating line length. Since the space between words does vary on the extant portions of the ms, it is likely to have varied in the reconstructed portions as well; however, there is no way to reconstruct this variation with any degree of confidence. Because of this uncertainty, as well as because of orthographic variation and because the electronic font cannot reflect the original handwriting with complete accuracy, the numbers cited here should be regarded as estimates rather than absolute figures.

Frags 3, 4, 13, 14, and 15 do not provide enough information for a confident estimate of line lengths, either because they are too small (frags 3, 13, 15) or because they contain too much extrabiblical material (frags 4, 14). Frag. 1–2 is a borderline case: five of its nineteen lines can be reconstructed according to the biblical text (lines 4, 5, 6, 10, 14). Whether such reconstruction is actually correct is highly uncertain, however, since the lengths of those five lines vary considerably:

Frag. 1–2 4 = 82 letter spaces
Frag. 1–2 5 = 104 letter spaces
Frag. 1–2 6 = 73 letter spaces
Frag. 1–2 10 = 97 letter spaces
Frag. 1–2 14 = 94 letter spaces

This situation can be contrasted with that of frags 5, 6, 7–9, and 10–12. In all of these fragments, the majority of lines can be reconstructed according to a known pentateuchal text. Often it is not possible to calculate accurately the length of the first and last lines of a fragment, as is the case for the first line of frags 5 and 6, the last lines of frags 6 and 10–12, and the last two lines of frag. 7–9. Three other lines were left out of the averages because they must have contained some sort of addition: Frag. 6 5 and frag. 7–9 4 require more than the biblical material because of the surrounding extant context, while frag. 7–9 12 is only about two-thirds the proper length when reconstructed according to known versions (66 letter-spaces). That is too much space to be accounted for by spacing considerations, and there is no point in this section of the pentateuchal text where a paragraph break or interval would be appropriate.

45 Often it is not possible to calculate accurately the length of the first and last lines of a fragment, as is the case for the first line of frags 5 and 6, the last lines of frags 6 and 10–12, and the last two lines of frag. 7–9. Three other lines were left out of the averages because they must have contained some sort of addition: Frag. 6 5 and frag. 7–9 4 require more than the biblical material because of the surrounding extant context, while frag. 7–9 12 is only about two-thirds the proper length when reconstructed according to known versions (66 letter-spaces). That is too much space to be accounted for by spacing considerations, and there is no point in this section of the pentateuchal text where a paragraph break or interval would be appropriate.

46 This calculation presumes an eyeskip in frag. 5 2. If the line followed the known versions at this point, it would have ca. 137 letter spaces, whereas lines 2, 4, and 5 have 102, 99, and 96 letter spaces respectively. Thus line 2 is clearly too long (for more detail, see the Comments on frag. 5 below). Another option would be to omit line 2 from the averages, in which case the average line-length for frag. 5 would be 99.0.

Frag. 5 Avg = 101.5 letter spaces
Frag. 6 Avg = 101.0 letter spaces
Frag. 7–9 Avg = 101.8 letter spaces
Frag. 10–12 Avg = 102.33 letter spaces

The consistency of the averages suggests that it is reasonable to conclude tentatively that most columns in 4Q158 had a line-length of approximately 100 letter spaces, although of course variation in column width is always possible, especially at the end of a sheet of leather.
2.1.4 Paleography

Allegro says nothing at all about the hand of 4Q158 in his DJD 5 edition. Strugnell characterizes it as “formell, hérodienne ou légèrement pré-hérodienne.”\textsuperscript{47} A comparison with Cross’s charts indeed reveals that the hand of 4Q158 is very similar to that of 1QM, which Cross characterizes as an “early Herodian formal script,” dating from ca. 30 BCE to the turn of the era.\textsuperscript{48} Notable differences include the following:

- \textit{dalet} in 4Q158 is not as narrow as in 1QM, and tends to have a heavy and steep “tick” or top left downstroke (compare 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}, line 5 in Cross’s Figure 2).
- \textit{kaf} in 4Q158 is consistently much longer and narrower than \textit{bet}; in this respect, 4Q158 is more conservative than 1QM, which anticipates the shorter, wider kafs of later Herodian times.\textsuperscript{49} The downstroke of final kaf also seems to preserve a slightly older form: it is not significantly curved as in 1QM and 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}, but is mostly straight, in the manner of the slightly earlier 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} (line 3 in Cross’s Figure 2).
- \textit{lameds}, on the other hand, almost always have a neat, heavy “flag” at the top, a feature that, according to Cross, does not become usual until the post-Herodian period.\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{47} Strugnell, "Notes en Marge," 168.


\textsuperscript{49} Cross, "Jewish Scripts," 229.

\textsuperscript{50} Cross, "Jewish Scripts," 229-30.
• *tsade* in 4Q158 exhibits a triangular thickening at the end of the right arm, instead of the upturned end of 1QM and earlier scripts; this thickening is characteristic of semiformal hands of approximately the same date (compare 4QNum).

2.1.5 Margins and Ruling

Most of the fragments preserve one margin; thus the right margin is visible in frags 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 14a; the left margin in frags 5, 13 and 14. Small traces of the following column are preserved in frags 5 and 14, and traces of the preceding column are preserved in frag. 4. Vertical and horizontal ruling seems to have been the norm for this manuscript: vertical ruling at the margin is preserved in frags 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, and apparently 13; horizontal ruling is visible (sometimes very faintly) in frags 1–2, 4–12, and 14. Ruling dots were employed frequently as well; they are preserved on frags 1 (lines 14–16), 3 (lines 2–3), 5 (lines 1–4), and 14a (lines 8–9).

2.1.6 Distance Between Lines

The average distance between lines, measured from the ruling lines where they are visible and from the tops of letters when they are not, varies from 6.03 mm in frag.1–2 to 4.83 mm in frag. 10–12, with the rest all falling between 5.0 and 5.5 mm. (Because of their small size, the distance between lines could not be determined for frags 13 and 15.)

51 There is a vertical line of ink preserved in the left margin of frag. 13; other vertical ruling lines in this ms are simple scoring of the leather, not ink. The line also appears one or two letter-spaces to the left of the end of line 2, the only line in this fragment that extends to the margin. It is possible, however, that line 2 was itself shorter than normal and that other lines in this fragment did reach as far as the marginal line. See further section 2.9.3 below.
2.1.7 Orthography

4Q158 exhibits an orthography that is consistently fuller than that of MT and SP (see chart below). In general, it exhibits the orthographic and morphological features that Tov associates with “Qumran [scribal] practice.”\(^{52}\) The fuller spelling, with \(\text{\textit{v}}\) as \textit{mater lectionis}, appears in every occurrence of e.g. קוזר, שעלה, מושה, נ험, בוא, יעקבר, אוחיו, and תות, ייעקב, כל, מושה, עולם, and שעים, whileجلופ (6 4).\(^{53}\) Verb forms with \(\dot{o}\) (G imperfect of the strong verb and of verbs I-\(\dot{a}\); G infinitive, imperative, and participle) also, as a rule, are spelled with \(\text{\textit{v}}\); e.g., בָּל frag. 1–2 12, יפרג frag. 5 4, לשרו frag. 1–2 16, בּומד frag. 10–12 11, אמר frag. 7 3, וינב frag. 9 1. An exception to this rule is the converted imperfect ויאמר, which always appears in the more historically correct spelling, without the \textit{mater lectionis}.

Possessive, objective, and prepositional suffixes nearly always occur in their lengthened forms with \(\text{\textit{h}}\)-; e.g. שמכה frag. 1–2 5, ייעלרה frag. 1–2 8, לכה frag. 4 1, יפרג frag. 4 7, איננה frag. 7 8. Note also the lengthened 2mp perfect form ראיתמה in frag. 7 6. The two occurrences of 3mp object suffixes, however, are spelled without \(\text{\textit{h}}\) (תלמה frag. 7 4 and אֵלָדָים frag. 14 5), as is the one occurrence of a 3mp possessive suffix on a singular noun (יד מ frag. 14 6). The 3ms pronoun is spelled והא on two occasions (frag. 1–2 12, frag. 10–12 10) and once והא (frag. 13 2); in one case the spelling is unclear

\(^{52}\) See Tov, \textit{Textual Criticism}, 109.

\(^{53}\) Note, however, the defective spelling בָּל in frag. 8 2.
because the manuscript breaks off (frag. 7 11). The spelling of כִּי is inconsistent: three times כִּי (frag. 9 4, frag. 10–12 8, 13) and four times כִּי (frag. 7 6, 8, frag. 10–12 6, 10).

The following table illustrates the orthography of 4Q158 where a parallel exists in MT and SP:

TABLE 2.2

ORTHOGRAPHY OF 4Q158

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frag. Line</th>
<th>Pentateuch</th>
<th>4Q158</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>SP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1–2 4</td>
<td>Gen 32:27</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–2 5</td>
<td>Gen 32:28</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–2 6</td>
<td>Gen 32:30</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–2 7</td>
<td>Gen 32:30</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–2 14</td>
<td>Exod 4:27</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–2 15</td>
<td>Exod 4:28</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–2 16</td>
<td>Exod 3:12</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>~Exod 24:5</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2</td>
<td>Exod 19:19</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 3</td>
<td>Exod 19:21</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 4</td>
<td>Exod 19:22</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 4</td>
<td>Exod 19:22</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 4</td>
<td>Exod 20:21</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 4</td>
<td>Exod 20:22</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 5</td>
<td>Deut 5:29</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 7</td>
<td>Deut 18:19</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 1</td>
<td>Exod 20:12</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 2</td>
<td>Exod 20:16</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 2</td>
<td>Exod 20:17</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 2</td>
<td>Exod 20:17</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 3</td>
<td>Deut 5:30</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 3</td>
<td>Deut 5:30</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 4</td>
<td>Deut 5:31</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6</td>
<td>Exod 20:22</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
<td>יָמִּיר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Hebrew Text</td>
<td>English Translation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6</td>
<td>Exod 20:22</td>
<td>כי עמכם עמקם</td>
<td>Thou hast filled them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 6</td>
<td>Exod 20:24</td>
<td>כי עולתהיכמה עכליתך</td>
<td>Thou hast filled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 7</td>
<td>Exod 20:23</td>
<td>כי לכו עכליתך</td>
<td>Thou hast filled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 1</td>
<td>Exod 21:6</td>
<td>כי לא לעמלךtréalך</td>
<td>Thou hast filled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 5</td>
<td>Exod 22:5</td>
<td>כי ללבנה לעמלך틀יתך</td>
<td>Thou hast filled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 12</td>
<td>Exod 22:12</td>
<td>כי ללבנה לעמלך틀יתך</td>
<td>Thou hast filled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2.2 (continued)
2.1.8 Textual Affiliation

The pentateuchal text reflected in 4Q158 has obvious affinities to the pre-
Samaritan tradition, since it reflects the major rearrangement in Exodus 20 that occurs in
SP and 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m}. In smaller details, however, the textual affinities of 4Q158 are not
so clear (see Table 2.3). Where MT, SP, and G differ, 4Q158 sides with MT against the
others only once. (The number rises to four if we include instances where the variant in
question is only recognizable in Hebrew, and thus the G witness is not relevant.) It sides
with G against MT and SP ten times, but sides with MT SP against G twelve times.
Agreement with SP against MT G, which we might expect to be prevalent, occurs only
five times. Furthermore, in seventeen instances, 4Q158 preserves a unique reading.

\begin{table}
\centering
\caption{Textual Affiliations of Variants in 4Q158\textsuperscript{54}}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|}
\hline
Affiliation & Locations (frag., line) & TOTAL \\
\hline
1. & 158 = MT, \(\neq\) G SP & 10–12 8 & 1 \\
\hline
2. & 158 = MT SP, \(\neq\) G & 1–2 15; 2–5 2; 5 3; 5 4; 6 3; 7–9 10; 10–12 6; 10–12 7; 10–12 9; 10–12 10; 10–12 12 & 12 \\
\hline
3. & 158 = MT G, \(\neq\) SP & 7–9 7; 7–9 17; 10–12 5; 10–12 6 & 4 \\
\hline
4. & 158 = G, \(\neq\) MT SP & 1–2 4; 1–2 6; 7–9 2; 7–9 7 (3x); 7–9 11; 7–9 16 (158 also matches SP\textsuperscript{ms}); 10–12 3; 10–12 9 & 10 \\
\hline
5. & 158 = G SP, \(\neq\) MT & 10–12 6; 10–12 7; 10–12 11 & 3 \\
\hline
6. & 158 = G\textsuperscript{ms}, \(\neq\) SP MT G & 5 3; 10–12 13 & 2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{54} In my calculations, I have included only instances of textual variants; that is, I have excluded
variation that occurs in the context of major additions of unique material in 4Q158. I have included all
instances in which 4Q158 witnesses to a variant also attested in MT, SP, or G. I have excluded purely
orthographic variants.
TABLE 2.3 (continued)

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td><strong>158 = SP, ≠ G MT</strong></td>
<td>6 4; 7–9 9; 7–9 10; 10–12 6; 10–12 10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td><strong>158 ≠ MT G SP</strong></td>
<td>1–2 3; 1–2 4; 1–2 5; 1–2 13; 1–2 14; 4 3; 6 2; 6 5; 6 8; 10–12 7 (MT not extant here)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td><strong>158 ≠ MT SP (Hebrew issue)</strong></td>
<td>1–2 5; 1–2 6; 7–9 4; 7–9 10; 10–12 4; 10–12 6; 10–12 9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td><strong>158 = MT, ≠ SP (Hebrew issue)</strong></td>
<td>10–12 5 (3x)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.9 Paragraph Breaks

There is some evidence in 4Q158 of the marking off of paragraphs through the use of empty space, but the occurrence of paragraph breaks in the manuscript does not correlate with either the use of *petuchah* (פ) and *setumah* (ס) in MT or the use of קפס in SP. Individual cases are discussed in the Notes on Readings sections for each fragment. By way of summary, it can be noted that there are three cases where 4Q158 attests a paragraph break; in each of these cases MT and SP also have a break (frag. 7–9 9; frag. 10–12 6; frag. 13 3–4). However, in two cases 4Q158 definitely lacks a break that is attested in both MT and SP (frag. 7–9 2 and frag. 10–12 8), and once it lacks a break attested in SP but not in MT (frag. 5 3). There are a handful of instances in which reconstructing a paragraph break attested in MT or SP would make the text as known from other versions fit more easily in the space available (frag. 7–9 17, 18, 19; frag. 10–12 4, 11). On the other hand, in two instances there does not appear to be room in 4Q158 for breaks attested in MT or SP (frag. 7–9 1; frag. 10–12 1). Finally, numerous breaks attested in MT or SP may or may not have been present in 4Q158; it seems that there would be space for them, but they are not necessary to fill out the line.
2.1.10 This Edition

In the remainder of this chapter, I present each of the fragments of 4Q158. For each fragment, I have provided the following: a transcription, including a tentative reconstruction according to the pentateuchal text where possible; a translation; a list of notes on readings; and a list of textual variants, notes, and general comments on the contents of the fragment.⁵⁵ In the transcriptions, a dot over a letter (̇) indicates that the reading given is very probable but not definite; a circlet over a letter (֯) indicates that the visible ink traces are consistent with several possible letters and the reading is less certain. A question mark (?) indicates the presence of ink traces that cannot be identified. Series of question marks in the reconstructed sections of the text (????) indicate my inability to suggest a reconstruction at that point.

2.1.11 Reconstruction

My reconstruction of absent but probable pentateuchal text generally follows the MT. A decision between MT and SP as the “base text” for reconstruction is somewhat arbitrary, given that in minor details 4Q158 agrees with one against the other at an almost equal rate. I have opted for MT largely because of its wider accessibility. I will note in the Comments and Textual Notes for each fragment any significant variation between MT and SP in the reconstructed text. I will not note minor variations such as differences

------
⁵⁵ Variants were collated with the following editions: the various DJD editions of the Qumran biblical manuscripts; August von Gall, Der hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner (Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1918; reprint, 1966); John William Wevers, Genesis (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974); John William Wevers and U. Quast, Exodus (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991); John William Wevers and U. Quast, Deuteronomium (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977); Alexander Sperber, The Bible in Aramaic: Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts (Leiden: Brill, 1992); The Old Testament in Syriac according to the Peshitta Version (Leiden: Brill, 1972-).
in verb form, spelling, presence or absence of copula, etc. It should be kept in mind that, in most cases, the SP reading is just as likely to have been present as that of MT.

Despite my general policy of following the MT, there are a handful of instances where I will follow SP in reconstruction. First, in some cases a particular SP reading occurs multiple times and is extant at least once in 4Q158. It stands to reason that the other instances likely contained the same reading.\(^56\) Second, I follow SP in some cases of minor differences in the Sinai pericope, since in those cases the reading at hand appears to be affected by the more extensive changes to that block of text that appear in SP. All cases where I follow SP instead of MT will be noted in the Textual Notes.

With regard to orthography, the reconstruction follows the practices that occur most frequently in 4Q158, although this procedure is bound to produce some inaccuracies in cases where the manuscript’s spelling is inconsistent (e.g. הָבָּנָן).

2.2 Fragments 1–2

2.2.1 Transcription and Translation

\(^{56}\) One example is the repeated phrase שֶׁנֶּחֱשָׁב מַעְרַבִּים for MT שֶׁנֶּחֱשָׁב שֶׁנֶּחֱשָׁב מַעְרַבִּים in Exod 22:3, 6, 8. 4Q158 contains the longer SP version in frag. 10 6 (Exod 22:3); thus I have reconstructed it as occurring in the other instances as well.
למען ישאר ויראה כי לא יוכל ולגוש בך ויגע ותקעך.

וישאר ול翳ו יוהי תקע לבקשה ולעומת איש י คนו ובו פלאו ויחזק גם传播 עם שירתו.

ויראה כי רכבו בה ברה ויאמר לאל שכנא לך ולאני אמרו עḞשנלא בל אולתים.

כי והראתי פנים אל פניהם ויקראו הוא מדברו עḞשנלא בל אולתים.

ודבר יהוה אסתרו שלוחответו עלAccessoryו ולפיו שיבש תשלושה.

ויהיה להם להא鸠 הא יהודים שלוחответו עלAccessoryו ולפיו שיבש תשלושה.

לכל בשם יהוה אסתרו שלוחответו עלAccessoryו ולפיו שיבש תשלושה.

לכל בשם יהוה אסתרו שלוחответו עלAccessoryו ולפיו שיבש תשלושה.
1. s so that
2. [you have striven and p
3. And J]ac[ob ]remained alone there, and [a man] wrestled with him until the dawn came. And he saw that he could not prevail over him, so he struck him on the hollow of his hip socket, and Jacob’s hip socket was
4. [wrenched out of joint] when he wrestled with him. [And he seized him and said to him, “Release me, for dawn has come!” And he said to him, “I will not release you unless]
5. [you give a blessing (?)] to me.” He said to him, “What is your name?” [And he said to him, “[“Jacob.” He said, “No longer shall you be called Jacob, but rather Israel, because you have striven with God]
6. [and with humans and you have prevailed.” J[a]cob asked [and ]said, “Tell me, wh[at is your name?” But he said, “Why do you ask my name?”]
7. [And he bless[ed] him there, and he said to him, “May YH[WH] make you fruitful [and ….you[…
8. [kno]wledge and understanding, and may he deliver you from all violence and ?[…
9. until this day and until eternal generations[.]
10. And he went on his way after having blessed him there. And [Jacob] ca[led the name of the place Peni’el, because “I have seen God face to face, and yet my life has been saved.”]
11. And the sun [rose] upon him as he passed by Penue[l, and he was limping because of his hip… ]
12. on that day, and he said, “Do not ea[t …
13. upon the two sockets of the hip until to[day, because he struck Jacob on the hip socket, on the tendon of the sciatic nerve … YHWH spoke]
14. to Aaron, saying “Go to mee[t ]M[oses in the wilderness.” So he went, and he met him on the mountain of God, and he kissed him. And Moses related to Aaron all]
15. the words of YHWH with which he had sent him and all[ the signs with which he had commanded him, … ]
16. YHWH to me, saying “When you bring[ the people out from Egypt… ]
17. to go as passers-by (??), and see, they are thirt[y(? …
18. YHWH God[ ]h[ ]to[ …
19. drew off(?) [ ]to[ ]?
2.2.2 Notes on Readings

L. 2: What remains of the unidentified letter is a long vertical stroke ending well below the line; it must have belonged to a final letter. The lack of distinct curvature makes י or י more likely than י or י.

L. 3 (Gen 32:25): רְנֹ. Allegro reads רְנֹ but the second extant letter has very little hook—a feature more characteristic of י than י in this manuscript—while the first extant letter displays more evidence of a sharper hook.

L. 3 (Gen 32:25): וְ. The base of the נ and the very bottom of its vertical stroke are visible.

L. 4 (Gen 32:26): בְּ. Only the tiniest speck is visible at the edge of the leather, but it is consistent with the end of the bottom horizontal stroke of ב.

L. 4 (Gen 32:27): יַמְ. Allegro records no trace of the final ר, but, after a tear in the leather that obliterates most of the מ and the ר, a speck of ink is visible that must represent the top of the “serif” on the left side of the ר.

L. 5 (Gen 32:27): אֵל. Allegro places the bracket directly before אֵל but a speck of ink at the edge of the leather and then a space are clearly visible (as correctly noted in DSSEL).  

L. 5 (Gen 32:28): מָ. A tear obscures the right vertical stroke of the מ.

57 DSSEL = *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library* (ed. Emanuel Tov; Leiden: Brill, 2006). DSSEL and its corresponding print version, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*, usually reflect the transcriptions in the official publications, but sometimes corrections have been made. In the case of 4Q158, the transcription in DSSEL appears to be that of a provisional edition by Tov and Crawford, not that of DJD 5.
L. 5 (Gen 32:28): ל֯ו. Only a speck of the ל, the very bottom of the letter, remains.

L. 6 (Gen 32:29): וְע֯ם. On the plate as currently preserved in the IAA vault, a tiny fragment is located to the right of frag. 1. It contains traces of what appears to be an ע, although it is also feasible that the traces represent two letters, e.g. בֵי (parts of a vertical stroke with a horizontal stroke going off to the left at the bottom of the vertical, and then another horizontal stroke approaching the vertical stroke from the right). If the reading ע is correct, this tiny fragment may represent part of the word עעם, which should appear at the beginning of line 6. While there is some room to the right of the ע where one might expect to see part of the ה preserved, the distance is not so great as to require its presence. Furthermore, this tiny fragment is heavily damaged, and it is possible that remains of the ה may have flaked away.

L. 6 (Gen 32:30): יישו. The scribe first wrote וישל, then added א above the line.

L. 6 (Gen 32:30): הִיָּיוֹדְנָה. The scribe first wrote י after והיד, then added א above the line.

L. 8: תְע. About half of the long diagonal of the ע is visible to the right of ה.

L. 8: בָּית. The tops of ב and ה are missing due to damage to the leather.

L. 8: ]?י. Two specks of ink are visible on either side of a tear after the ה. It seems most likely that they belong to only one letter, but the presence of two letters here cannot be ruled out.
L. 9: [םלע]. Only about one third of the מ is visible, the upper right corner. In DSSEL this letter is transcribed as מ, but the rounded corner of the letter, much less sharp than that exhibited by medial מ, suggests that מ is in fact correct.

L. 11 (Gen 32:32): [משאר]. While the upper portion of the ב appears to be lost in all of the photographs I have examined, it is still perfectly visible on the original.

L. 13 (Gen 32:33): [יום]. While scarcely more than the right vertical of the ה is visible in PAM 43.424, slightly more of the horizontal stroke is preserved in PAM 41.803.

L. 13 (Gen 32:33 + Exod 4:27): Since SP has a קסם after Gen 32:33 and before Exod 4:27, and MT has a פ before Exod 4:27, it is possible that the scribe of 4Q158 left a paragraph break between the two passages.

L. 14 (Exod 4:27): [לкра]. The upper short stroke and the top of the long diagonal stroke of the א are preserved.

L. 14 (Exod 4:27): [רша]. The remains of what is likely the bottom right corner of מ, overlooked by Allegro, were noted by Strugnell.

L. 15 (Exod 4:28): [שלח]. The top of the ל is clearly visible above a gap in the leather, as is the far right corner of the base. On the other hand, only the tiniest speck at the bottom of the left vertical stroke of the ר remains on the other side of the gap.

L. 16: [ויהי]. Moisture damage causes the י to appear somewhat blurry and disfigured. There also appears to be too much space between it and the following ה. It is unclear whether this extra space could have arisen as a result of the moisture
damage, or whether the leather was perhaps already damaged when it was inscribed, causing the scribe to leave a bit more space than usual between the letters.

L. 16 (cf. Exod 3:12): בהאמשה. The apparent extra space between the ה and the ו is most likely due to a slight misalignment of the leather on either side of the crack running between the two letters. The slight spot of ink above the line between these two letters seems to have been accidental rather than intentional.

L. 17: שָלָשׁ? Only the top left of the ש is visible. The top and bottom horizontal strokes of the ב are visible, though the bottom stroke appears out of place, probably because of the tear at this point in the leather. The third letter is either ר or ד, but the tear runs directly through it, making a decision either way impossible.

L. 17: שָלָשׁ. Only the top right corner of the final letter is preserved, allowing for either Allegro and Strugnell’s reading שלש or Segal’s reading שלשת.58 However, given that the traces appear quite vertical, and that ש in this ms usually bulges slightly to the right on the right vertical stroke, ר may be somewhat more likely.

L. 18: אלוהים. There is clearly a trace of a letter following the lacuna after אלוהים (not noted previously); the speck perhaps represents the top left “serif” of a ה.

L. 18: ול. The top of the ול is clearly visible, ruling out all other possibilities.

58 Segal, "Biblical Exegesis," 52.
2.2.3 Comments and Textual Notes

This fragment combines material from Genesis 32 with material from Exod 4:27 and following. This particular juxtaposition is not attested elsewhere, and the connection between the two sections is not immediately evident. It was first suggested by Strugnell—albeit very tentatively—that the common theme might be the encounter with a potentially hostile divine being—thus the connection is not with Exod 4:27–31, but with the pericope that immediately precedes it, in which “YHWH met Moses and sought to kill him” (Exod 4:24).\(^{59}\) If indeed this link is the reason the two passages were joined (and no better alternative presents itself), then the “bridegroom of blood” episode (Exod 4:24–26) must have preceded our current fragment, since there is no room for it between the end of the Jacob story and the beginning of Exod 4:27 in line 13. All this suggests that the original context of this fragment was not the book of Genesis but the beginning of Exodus.\(^{60}\) In other words, in the context of the story of the divine attack upon Moses on his way back from Egypt, the editor would have inserted a “flashback” to the somewhat similar incident that befell Jacob on his way back to the land of Canaan.

Reconstruction of missing text in this fragment is only partially possible, due to the frequent deviations from the text of Genesis and Exodus as we know it. Lines

\(^{59}\) Strugnell, "Notes en Marge," 169. See also Emanuel Tov, "Biblical Texts as Reworked in Some Qumran Manuscripts with Special Attention to 4QRP and 4QParaGen-Exod," in The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls (eds. Eugene Ulrich and James C. VanderKam; Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 111-34, at p. 131. The two passages were in fact connected by Rashbam in his commentary to Gen 32:29, where he reasons that both Jacob and Moses did not behave as God intended and were thus punished (through the nighttime encounters). See Moshe Greenberg, Understanding Exodus (New York: Behrman House, 1969), 111.

\(^{60}\) Segal, "Biblical Exegesis," 48.
4–6, 10, 14 can be reconstructed according to the pentateuchal text, but the variation in line-length that such a reconstruction yields is more than we might expect (see section 2.1.3 above). In particular, lines 4 and 6 appear to be too short. It is true that the amount of space between words does vary substantially in this frag., so perhaps the reconstruction falls within acceptable bounds. On the other hand, the extant portions of lines 4 and 6 do not have as much space between words as e.g. line 5, which is much longer when reconstructed according to MT/SP. Thus, there is a real possibility that lines 4 and 6 contained otherwise unknown material. The contents of the other lines in this fragment are even more difficult to ascertain, as they must have contained substantial new material.

**L. 1–2:** The extant words do not reflect the text of Genesis prior to 32:25 (line 3), at least in any version known to us. The verb שרה was probably taken from Gen 32:29, but if it is correct to interpret this passage as a flashback in the context of Moses’ return to Egypt, it is unclear whether its subject is Jacob or Moses.

**L. 3 (Gen 32:25):** שמה > MT SP G Tg Syr.

**L. 4 (Gen 32:26–27):** אֲחָזַת ו > 4Q364 5b ii MT SP G Tg Syr.

**L. 4 (Gen 32:26–27):** אליו G (אַלַי Syr (סַי)) > MT SP Tg.

**L. 5 (Gen 32:27?–28):** על > MT SP G Tg Syr. It is possible that this word represents the end of an alternative formulation to MT ברכתני אם כי (although e.g. ברכת על seems syntactically awkward). On the other hand, given that line 4 as

---

61 Two early printed editions have לי ברכת; see Sperber ad loc.
reconstructed according to MT is fairly short, it is also possible that line 4 contained some added material that continued into the beginning of line 5.

L. 5 (Gen 32:28): ל֯אלִי MT SP.

L. 5 (Gen 32:28): ל֯ MT SP G Tg Syr.

L. 5 (Gen 32:28): [ויאמר]. Allegro reconstructs [ויגד] in this lacuna. He does not explain why he chooses this reconstruction rather than the MT, SP reading ויאמר, for which there is ample space.

L. 6 (Gen 32:30): והגדה MT SP.

L. 6 (Gen 32:30): מִלי ה MT SP 4Q364 5b ii Gmiss] > MT SP Tg Syr וֹטִי G.

L. 7–10 (Gen 32:30 + Add.): וַיַּאֲמַר לָו | > MT SP G Tg Syr. The statement ויברך אתו שם in Genesis most likely refers simply to the man’s taking leave of Jacob.62 However, the editor (or a previous scribe) seems to have interpreted it to imply that Jacob received a blessing that was not recorded in Genesis. He therefore inserted a blessing, which now occupies lines 7–9; line 10 begins with a Wiederaufnahme that brackets the insertion.63 It is possible that this blessing was at least partially modelled upon Isaac’s blessing of Jacob in Gen 28:3–4, which

62 See NAB, “With that, he bade him farewell,” NJPSV, “And he took leave of him there,” and Segal, “Biblical Exegesis,” 59. The connection, of course, is that a greeting or parting word would often be accompanied by a blessing; see E. A. Speiser, *Genesis* (AB 1; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1964), 202. Compare also the etymology for English “goodbye” as a contraction of “God be with you” (*OED*, s.v.).

63 On the technique of Wiederaufnahme or repetitive resumption to mark an insertion, see Michael A. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985), 85-86.
similarly begins with יפרך. It should be noted, however, that the continuation of the blessing in lines 8 and 9 shows no trace of connection to Genesis 28.

It is possible that this addition was also present in 4Q364. Frag. 5b col. ii reads:

12 [יִעֲקֹב יָאוֹמֵר הַנִּיחֹדֶשׁ אֵצָל] יֵלָה יָבוֹשָׁה[ יָאוֹמֵר]
13 [לֵךְ הַזָּהֲלֵי לָשְׂמֵי וְבֵרֵךְ אֶתְוֹ שָׁם וְיִסְמַכְּלָה לֶזָּהֲלֵי] (ז

MT and other witnesses follow the end of Gen 32:30, שָׁמַכְּלָה אֶתְוֹ כָּל, with יָאוֹמֵר, וְיָבְרַךְ אֵצָל שָׁם, “And Jacob called…,” and not וְיָאָמֵר; thus 4Q364 and 4Q158 share a unique reading. But 4Q364 5b ii 13 is the last preserved line in the column, so it is impossible to determine for certain whether the addition was present in 4Q364.

L. 12: The note in Gen 32:33 on the custom of not eating the thigh muscle has been transformed, it appears, into a divine command (וְיָאוֹמֵר אֵל הַהַלּוֹם וְנַרָּאוּ אָף שָׁם). We can therefore presume that the missing part of line 11 contained not only the end of Gen 32:32 but also some kind of introduction of the command in line 12 (such as, e.g., יָאוֹמֵר אֵל הַהַלּוֹם וְנַרָּאוּ אָף שָׁם, “[God appeared to Jacob] on that day”). Of course we cannot be certain that God is the speaker of the command—theoretically it could be Jacob who issues the command to his wives and children. On the other hand, the intervention at this point is probably more understandable if the concern was to provide divine warrant for a halakhic practice, as opposed to describing it as commanded by the patriarch. Furthermore, transformation of a folk custom into a

64 This transcription follows Tov and White, DJD 13:213.
65 See also the discussion in Segal, "Biblical Exegesis," 60.
divinely prescribed practice is also attested in Jubilees. God is therefore the most likely speaker. In any case, it seems clear that the remainder of line 12 would have contained the rest of the command as well as a statement of continuous compliance that probably looked very much like Gen 32:33: “Therefore the children of Israel do not eat the thigh muscle that is on the hip socket, to this day…”

L. 13 (Gen 32:33): כמות MT SP G Tg Syr. This line may have contained the end of Gen 32:33, and the line surely ended with the first words of Exod 4:27. The rest of the line may have been taken up with some sort of transition back to Exodus after the interpolation of the Genesis narrative, or there may simply have been an interval, as Strugnell suggests.


L. 15 (Exod 4:28): שלח֯ ואשר MT SP (שלחהו) G Gmss Syr Tg. The rest of the line may have been taken up with some sort of transition back to Exodus after the interpolation of the Genesis narrative, or there may simply have been an interval, as Strugnell suggests.

L. 16: This line has Moses speaking to Aaron and recounting God’s words to him (found in Exod 3:12), apparently an expansion meant to provide in more detail the contents of the discourse referred to in Exod 4:28, “And Moses related to Aaron all the words…” . Such a move appears similar—though not identical—to the practice, frequent in SP and related texts, of providing a detailed account of the fulfillment of a command where this is lacking in other versions. The missing part

66 In Jub 28:6, what is presented in Gen 29:26 as a local custom—the obligation to marry off the oldest daughter before any of her younger sisters—becomes a law “ordained and written on the heavenly tablets.”


68 For examples and discussion, see section 5.2 below.
of line 15 probably contained the end of Exod 4:28 as well as the beginning of Moses’ speech to Aaron.

L. 17: The words preserved here and in the remainder of the fragment do not follow the text of Exodus. The words לֶלֹּכֶת and שלטָה may indicate that this line is a continuation of Moses’ recollection of God’s words to him in chapter 3, as Segal suggests, since they are somewhat similar to God’s instructions to Moses on what the Israelites should say to Pharaoh: “And now, let us go (לֶלֹּכֶת) a three days’ journey (יָמִים שלשת דרך) into the wilderness…” (Exod 3:18). 69

L. 17: עָבִים. This word presents syntactic difficulties no matter how it is interpreted. If the reading עָבִים is correct, the sense of this word is difficult to understand. The word “Hebrews” is spelled in this way throughout much of the beginning of Exodus (though not in Exod 3:18, עָבִים), so perhaps one could translate “to go as Hebrews.” 70 Reading the word as עָבִים, “slaves,” yields a similar syntactic construction, “to go as slaves,” although in this case it would seem less clear that לֶלֹּכֶת refers to the journey into the wilderness: it may refer instead more generally to the status of the Israelites as slaves. The syntax would seem more natural if the word was interpreted as a participle (either “to go and pass by” or “to go and

69 Segal, "Biblical Exegesis," 52. Note, however, that the reading שלטָה is somewhat more likely paleographically than Segal’s reading שלטָה (see Notes on Readings). It should also be noted that Exod 5:3 contains much of the same language as Exod 3:18, since it reports Moses and Aaron’s first meeting with Pharaoh. Segal is probably correct, however, to identify lines 17–19 as a continuation of Moses’ report to Aaron, since there is scarcely space in what remains missing of line 16 to effect a transition from that report to the continuation of the narrative, to say nothing of the fact that most or all of Exod 4:29–5:2 would have to have been omitted.

70 Segal ultimately comes down in favor of this suggestion; see Segal, "Biblical Exegesis," 52.
worship”), but the orthography of 4Q158 would lead us in this case to expect the spellingعقורים orعبارة. Without more of the immediately preceding context, a conclusive decision seems impossible.

**L. 17:** שלא? Strugnell suggests that, if the readingשלא is correct, the reference might be to the length of the Egyptian captivity, 430 years.

**L. 19:** נשל. The correct interpretation of these letters is unclear, but given the presence of the root נשל in Exod 3:5 ( shaltונעלדמעלונעלד, “remove your sandals from your feet”), it seems that Moses’ recollection continues, perhaps now referencing his reaction to God’s first words from the burning bush.71

2.3 Fragment 3

2.3.1 Transcription and Translation

1. יכרא יוקוב
2. בא ancor יوذת מלק
3. אבורי לבא אל
4. ??

1. And Jacob called [ 2. in this land ml[ … 3. my fathers to come to[ 4. [ ??[

71 For the link between נשל in line 19 and Exod 3:5, see Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 54.
2.3.2 Notes on Readings

It appears that line 1 was preceded by an empty line. It is possible that this represents the top margin of the fragment, although the top edge of the fragment is jagged and torn. Furthermore, a tiny speck appears at the very top of the fragment in some photos (most visible on PAM 42.619 but also apparent on PAM 43.424). I could not detect it on the original, indicating that the spot may simply be a shadow, although it may just as likely have been lost since the time of the photographs. If the spot is ink, it would represent the bottom of the long downstroke of a letter two lines above line 1, and suggest that this is not the top margin.

On the other hand, the right edge of this fragment definitely represents the righthand margin of the column; there are ruling dots visible at the beginning of lines 2 and 3.

L. 2: [ה]. Allegro marks the letter read here as ל as unidentifiable, while DSSEL reads [ר]ט. What remains of the letter in question is a small hook representing a top right corner, but also a spot of ink on the torn edge of the fragment well above the line (visible most clearly on PAM 41.803, but also on the original). While the traces at line level would be consistent with several letters, the traces of ink above the line strongly suggest ל.

L. 3: [ר]. Only a speck of the right corner of the ל survives.

L. 4: Two traces of ink are visible, the first a tiny speck; the second apparently a top horizontal stroke as in ב, נ, ונ, or פ.
2.3.3 Comments and Textual Notes

The contents of this fragment do not directly reflect any pentateuchal text. Allegro suggested that perhaps the words يְחַכָּר וַיִּקְרָא represented the beginning of Gen 32:31, יְחַכֶּר וַיֵּקְרָא שֶם הַמֶּרֶם מִנָּאָל... This solution does not seem likely. First, Gen 32:31 was probably contained in frag. 1 (only the first two letters of the verse, 'וַיִּקְרָא', are preserved, but Gen 32:30 and 32 are partially preserved, making it highly likely that v. 31 was there as well, in the missing part of frag. 1 10). Second, none of the material in the rest of frag. 3 has any connection to Genesis 32. 72 Strugnell tentatively raises another possibility: “Pourrait-il aussi faire partie d’un discours de Jacob avant sa mort?” 73 The opening phrase יְחַכָּר וַיִּקְרָא occurs in Gen 49:1 to introduce Jacob’s deathbed address to his children, but, as Segal points out, the content of Jacob’s long poem does not match the remaining text of frag. 3. 74 Segal may be correct in suggesting that a better context might be Jacob’s instructions to Joseph in Gen 47:29–30:

יְחַכֶּר וַיִּקְרָא לְיוֹסֵף לֵאמֶר לָא נָא חַבְרֵנִי בֵּיתֵרֵנִי שֶׁבֶּרֶה בֻּמָּתָנַי בַּמִּצְרָא קִבֵּלֵנִי נָא אֵל בּי קִבְרֵנִי וְקִבֵּלֵנִי מִנִּמְצָרָא “Jacob summoned his son, Joseph, and said to him... ‘Do not bury me in Egypt. When I lie down with my fathers, take me up from Egypt and bury me in their burial place.’”

Even in relation to this context, frag. 3 would represent a paraphrase or retelling of the episode, as there is little actual overlap in vocabulary aside from

72 See also Segal, "Biblical Exegesis," 54.
73 Strugnell, "Notes en Marge," 170.
74 Segal, "Biblical Exegesis," 54.
“my fathers.” Furthermore, if the line-lengths in the column represented by frag. 3 are consistent with those reconstructed for other fragments (ca. 100 letter-spaces), the episode must have been considerably expanded vis-à-vis Jacob’s short utterance in Gen 47:29–30 (barely a verse in length). But בַּאֶרֶץ היהוּדָה could easily refer to Egypt, and לֵבָנָה אלה to Jacob’s request that his body be returned to Canaan.75

The placement of this fragment relative to others in 4Q158 is also unclear. The most obvious conclusion would be that the fragment should be located in Genesis, as Segal suggests.76 However, frag. 1–2 demonstrates that Genesis material can also appear in new settings in this manuscript. Given the small amount of text preserved in frag. 3, the possibility cannot be ruled out that this paraphrase of Jacob’s request to be buried in Canaan has been inserted into the Exodus narrative at some point. On a parallel with the apparently analogical join of two pericopes in frag. 1–2, one could tentatively suggest that perhaps this pericope could have been connected with Joseph’s request that his bones be taken up from Egypt (Gen 50:25), or the note that that request was fulfilled at the time of the exodus (Exod 13:19).

75 Segal actually reconstructs line 2 as בַּאֶרֶץ היהוּדָה מַצְמִיע; Segal, "Biblical Exegesis," 54. However, this syntax strikes me as awkward, and הזאת לארץ /洼 or הזאת ההארץ never occurs in the Hebrew Bible with an appositional place name. Furthermore, the final, partially visible letter is more likely to be ל than צ (see Notes on Readings).

76 Segal, "Biblical Exegesis," 54.
2.4 Fragment 4

2.4.1 Column i: Transcription and Notes on Readings

None of the previously published transcriptions of 4Q158 has noted the presence of the letters of another column to the right of the main column of frag. 4.77

The line numbers used here refer to the lineation of column ii.

L. 4: The extant traces are of a largish spot on the far left, a vertical stroke slightly to the right of the spot, bowed to the right, and a downward-sloping horizontal stroke to the right of the vertical, which continues slightly beyond the vertical. The resulting “sharp corner” on the lower left rules out ס, and that plus the spot (a hook or serif) in the top left corner rules out ט. Final ס is probably the most likely alternative if these traces represent a single letter, but this would be extremely short for a final ס in this manuscript, where they usually extend well below the line. I think it more probable that the traces represent two letters: a somewhat compressed ר or possibly ד (the crucial top right corner is not preserved), preceded by a letter with a bottom horizontal stroke such as ב, כ, מ, or פ. For the final letter, ר may be more

77 It is noted in the draft materials for DJD 5A (which was to have been edited by Moshe Bernstein and George Brooke).
likely than ר because it appears that ר is more likely to be written so narrowly (compare the ר of רָמָר in frag. 1, line 5). The relatively short height of the first letter suggests ב, but other possibilities should not be ruled out.

**L. 5:** Traces of ink are visible within a blotch where the leather has been disfigured.

**L. 6:** The hook on the final letter is shorter and less angled than the hook on the previous letter, making the reading י almost certain.
1. [commanded you] [When you bring out]  
2. the people from Egypt you shall worship [God upon this mountain… ??? . He built an altar under the mountain and twelve stone pillars]  
3. according to the number of the twelve tribes[ of Israel. And he sent the young men of Israel... ??? ]  
4. and he offered up the burnt offering upon the altar[ , and he offered bulls as sacrifices of well-being to YHWH (?). And Moses took half of the blood and put it]  
5. in bowls, and half of the blood he sprinkled upon the [altar … ]  
6. which I showed to Abraham and to ??[ Isaac and to Jacob…]  
7. with them to bec[ome] a God to them and to their se[e]d ?[  
8. [f]oreve[r] ]t ?[ ]?[ YHWH ?[  
9. [ ]wh[  

2.4.2 Column ii: Transcription and Translation

1. [ ]תְּלַעְתָּה ]  
2. [תֹּפֶר עָשָׂה שְׁבָטָּה יִשְׂרָאֵל וִיהָלָל נְעֵרָּה בִּנְיִשְׂרָאֵל ]  
3. [וָאֱלַעְתָּה יְהוָה בַּמִּצְרָאֵל ]  
4. [בְּאָנָבָה זְחִית הָדֶם נָעֲרָּה בִּשָּׁמְשׁוֹן ]  
5. [אֶשֶּׁר הָלַעְתָּה אֶל אֲבָרְכָּהוֹ אֲוֶל ]  
6. [אָמְתָּה לְיָהוָה ]  
7. [עָלֵיהֶם לְלַעְתָּה לְאָבָרְכֶם ]  
8. [וְיָשָׁם ]  
9. [ ]
2.4.3 Notes on Readings

L. 1: לawah. Only the right vertical and the very bottom of the left vertical remain of ה.

L. 2 (Exod 3:12): תעבדות. Only the right vertical stroke of ד remains.

L. 3 (Exod 24:4): מעשה. A crease runs straight over the ר, obscuring all but the bottom of the vertical.

L. 3 (Exod 24:4): שבטי. Only the bottom of י is visible.

L. 4 (~Exod 24:5): [השלט]. The ה is completely obscured by deterioration of the surface of the leather.

L. 5 (Exod 24:6): והחי. The hook of the ה is visible; the rest is obscured by a crack. The final י is not visible at all in PAM 43.424, but from the original it is clear that the leather at the edge of the following hole had been folded under; it has now been unfolded and the entire י is clearly visible.

L. 5 (Exod 24:6): דםה. Allegro and DSSEL find no trace of the ד. However, like the י in the previous word, this letter was on a bit of leather that had been folded under but now is clearly visible.

L. 6: הרהמזות. This is Allegro’s reading (although he regards it as certain). Segal suggests that the reading הרהמזות is “just as plausible,” but I would disagree. The י is a bit disfigured by crumpling of the leather, but is basically clear. The top left “serif” of ר is slightly obscured by a crack, but otherwise the letter is clear. Finally, the א itself is
crystal-clear, while taking the two left strokes as ר, as Segal suggests, yields a mangle that can scarcely be construed as an א under any circumstances.\(^{78}\)

L. 6: ??ר???. The word has been erased; it is unclear precisely how many letters were originally written. As Strugnell points out, the erased word was probably יִשָּׁב; he suggests that the scribe intended to write יֵשָׁב instead.\(^{79}\) Indeed, the bottom of the long vertical stroke of ר was not completely rubbed out, and remains visible.

L. 7: וָלֹאַלָּו. This is Strugnell’s reading\(^ {80}\), while Allegro suggests לֹאַלָּו. The leather here is badly damaged, and a crack which now separates the two parts of frag. 4 runs through the middle of the word. In all the photographs I have examined, it appears that a small flap of leather containing the space between lines 7 and 8 has been pushed up, further obscuring the word. However, on the original the two parts are now fully separated, which makes interpretation somewhat easier. It seems very likely that Strugnell’s reading is correct. The ו and ל are clear. Then come traces of the bottoms of two vertical strokes. The first is long enough and vertical enough to make clear that it is much more likely to be ר, as Strugnell suggests, than Allegro’s ע. The mere traces of the second stroke, indicating that at least one more letter was present before the ע, are further evidence that Allegro’s reading is incorrect. Although only a small speck is preserved, the stroke could well be the bottom of ר. Next, on the other side of the crack, a thin strip

---

\(^{78}\) See Segal, "Biblical Exegesis," 49. Note that Segal does not seem to interpret the word in a new meaning despite the different interpretation of the reading: he still views it as הָאָרָא.

\(^{79}\) Strugnell, "Notes en Marge," 170.

\(^{80}\) Strugnell, "Notes en Marge," 170.
of leather with a stroke of ink on it branches off from the ב (which is clear). This short stroke, mostly vertical but angling down slightly from right to left, certainly cannot be interpreted with much confidence, since most of the letter that it belongs to is missing. It would, however, be consistent with the long right-hand stroke of א: the ink ends slightly less than halfway down the adjacent ב, matching the relative shortness of א elsewhere in the ms (compare ב in frag. 1–2 13, where the א is actually shorter than the ב). Thus the reading דנער is a good fit for the traces on the ms.

L. 8: והיה. This reading is clear on PAM 41.313. Additional damage has obscured the reading in later photographs, but the original is still clear.

L. 8: ]?. Only a tiny speck of ink is visible on the far left edge of the leather.

L. 9: ]ם[. These letters are not noted by Allegro or in subsequent publications; they are visible in PAM 41.313 and 41.803 on a piece of leather that seems to have broken off prior to the taking of later photographs. While the ב is clear, only a speck of the letter transcribed here as ו remains; the letter in question appears not to have had an upper horizontal stroke; thus e.g. ר, ק, or ו are also possible.

2.4.4 Comments and Textual Notes

The first identifiable lines in this fragment juxtapose Exod 3:12 and Exod 24:4. After (more or less) following the pentateuchal text through Exod 24:6, the fragment again presents us with unfamiliar material in lines 6–9. The relatively small size and poor condition of the fragment make it difficult to understand precisely how its different units were connected.
L. 1–2 (? + Exod 3:12): Since the general context of this fragment appears to be Exodus 24, the words “he commanded you” in line 1 and the citation from Exod 3:12 seem to indicate that these lines contained a “flashback” or reminder (to Moses, the Israelites, or the reader) that the covenant ratification ceremony they are about to perform takes place in conformity with God’s earlier words: “When you lead the people out from Egypt, you shall worship God upon this mountain.”81 Although in the original context God’s prediction appears to function more as a promise or reassurance, the words זה ההר indicate that the editor responsible for this insertion interpreted the words as a command, now fulfilled at Sinai.82

L. 2 (Exod 3:12 + Exod 24:4[?]): MT SP G\textsuperscript{miss} Syr Tg | לכה צוה הלעם. The continuation of this line must have contained the conclusion of Exod 3:12 and, at the very least, a significant portion of Exod 24:4. The reconstruction proposed here, starting with ויבן in 24:4a, γ, seems the minimum required for sense in the continuation in line 3. If this is correct, then the line length of frag. 4 col ii would have been at least 73 letter-spaces and possibly more, considerably wider than the approximately 50 letter-spaces that Segal assumes on the basis of his reconstruction of lines 3–4 according to MT (see further below).

L. 2 (Exod 24:4 [?]): [מטביה] MT SP.

81 Segal, "Biblical Exegesis," 53. See also Strugnell, "Notes en Marge," 170.

82 Many commentators interpret the statement הזה ההר as the “sign” (אות) that God gives Moses as an assurance that it is he who sends Moses. Others argue that the future worship cannot be a sign meant to give assurance to Moses since it is to happen so far in the future; even so, the statement functions in the context as a divine promise of success, not as a command. For detailed discussion, see e.g. Brevard S. Childs, The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary (Old Testament Library; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974), 56-60; Cornelis Houtman, Exodus: Vol. 1 (Historical Commentary on the Old Testament; Kampen: Kok, 1993), 364-65.
L. 3 (Exod 24:4): יֵשְׁם עָשָׂר לְשֵׁנֵי עָשָׂר MT SP G Tg Syr. Reconstructing this line according to MT/SP yields a line only about two-thirds as long as what I proposed as a minimum for the length of line 2. I would suggest that additional material is not difficult to imagine, given the frequent divergences from the known versions throughout this fragment as well as the fact that the text extant in line 4 diverges significantly from the supposed continuation in Exod 24:5. This option seems more plausible than positing the transition (in line 2) in the space of only a few words from the middle of Exod 3:12 to the end of Exod 24:4.

L. 4 (~Exod 24.5): וַיִּעַל עָלָה ויָהְבוּ אֶת בְּנֵי שֶׁלֹּמָיו לְיהוָה[ז] וַיִּשְׁלַח בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל[ח]. The sacrificing is presented here, in contrast to MT and other witnesses, as performed by Moses alone—another factor that might hint at unknown material in line 3, since it seems odd that Moses would “send out the youths of the children of Israel” if they no longer are responsible for performing the sacrifices. Perhaps the text in line 3 gave them some other role, or omitted them altogether. In any case, Segal’s proposed reconstruction, וַיִּשְׁלַח בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל does not take account of this difficulty. The transition from line 3 to line 4, therefore, cannot be regarded as providing clear evidence of the width of this column. Equally, it is unclear exactly how line 4 would have continued. It is possible, though of course not certain, that the extant text of line 4 simply replaces MT יֵשְׁם עָשָׂר, and that the line continued with the following words, “and

he sacrificed sacrifices of well-being…” (presumably with the verb in the singular, corresponding to ויעל). Reconstructing from here to the end of the verse according to MT, plus the beginning of Exod 24:6, with which the line must have ended, yields a line-length close to that tentatively posited for line 2. On the other hand, if the column was even wider, additional material might have been included.

L. 4 (Exod 24:5): [פרים] + בְּנֵי בָּכָר MT SP.

L. 5 (Exod 24:6): [אנגורת] + אָגוֹרָת MT SP.

L. 6–7: The material in these two lines appears to be linked to the preceding text of Exod 24:4–6 through the term ברית, “covenant,” though that word is not extant in this fragment. As Segal and Strugnell have noted, the language of line 7 is reminiscent of the “covenant” texts Gen 17:7 and Exod 6:7.84 Both contain the construction היה + ל + אלהים, while Gen 17:7 adds לִעָרֵךְ. More broadly, both discuss YHWH’s promise to Abraham and his descendants to be their God and to give them the Land. The covenant in Genesis 17 is obviously made with Abraham alone, but Exodus 6 makes clear that this covenant has been extended to all of the patriarchs and their descendants: “I appeared (וארא) to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob as El Shaddai, but my name, YHWH, I did not make known to them. And I also made a covenant with them…” (Exod 6:3–4αα). In this fragment, YHWH reveals not himself but, presumably, his covenant to the patriarchs (אשר הוראת).

The precise transition between the extant parts of lines 5 and 6 is unclear, but the text shifts from 3rd-person narrative description of Moses’ actions to 1st-person speech of God. We can surmise that this switch is related to what follows the extant part of line 5 (Exod 24:6) in the biblical text: Exod 24:7 begins, “And he took the book of the covenant and read it aloud to the people.” Lines 6–7 therefore seem to represent the contents of the ספר הברית, in the form of a divine recollection of the covenant made with the patriarchs.85 How much space this divine address originally occupied in the text of 4Q158 is unfortunately impossible to determine.

A closer look at the new material in lines 6–7 indicates that we appear to have before us not simply allusion to the earlier covenant texts but their interweaving into a new whole. To take the clearest part first, the final four extant words of line 7, והם ירא ויהי ולאלוהים מעברר, match almost exactly Gen 17:7b, אחריך וזרעך לאלהים לך להיות. The shift to third-person plural suffixes was likely prompted by the formulation of line 6, אשרسري והילא את אלהים את Авraham声称 את אתייעקוק ויאכשב ואליעקוק, אברח ויאכשב ואליעקוק. This formulation, in turn, as well as the אתם at the beginning of line 7, seems to have been drawn from Exod 6:3–4:

ואוה את אלהים אתzcחוכ ויאכשב ואליעקוק יראה את אליעקוק ואליעקוק ואליעקוק ואליעקוק ואליעקוק, “I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob as El Shaddai, but by my name, YHWH, I did not make myself known to them. I also established my covenant \textit{with them}, to give them the land of Canaan…”

There are two significant differences between these verses and their reflection in frag. 4 6–7: the use of the H instead of the N of ראוה, and the fact that אתם (presumably

the conclusion of the phrase "אתם בריתי את הקימותי") is followed not by the land promise but by YHWH’s promise to be the God of the patriarchs. The first difference probably stems from the new context of this verse in 4Q158, the covenant ratification ceremony at Sinai. In the context of this covenant ceremony, the original topic of Exod 6:3a, God’s self-revelation to the patriarchs as El Shaddai rather than YHWH, is less relevant. The editor keeps the focus on the issue at hand by adapting the source text to refer to God’s revelation of something else (presumably the covenant) rather than to God’s self-revelation.

That YHWH’s promise to be the God of the patriarchs and their descendants, rather than the promise of land, follows the (presumed) mention of God’s covenant in frag. 4 6–7 is likely the result of the combination or reading-together of Exod 6:3–7 and Gen 17:7–8. Both texts contain the promise of land and the promise that YHWH will be a God to the patriarchs, but Gen 17:7 has the latter promise first, followed by the promise of land. In Exodus 6, the mention of the covenant is followed first by the land promise (6:4), then by God’s acknowledgment of Israel’s suffering in Egypt and promise to redeem them from their suffering (6:5–6). Only then does God mention that “I will take you for myself as a people and I will become your God, and you will know that I am YHWH your God who leads you out from under the burdens of Egypt” (6:7). Since the text of frag. 4 deteriorates after line 7 (only a few words are legible in line 8), it is unclear whether 4Q158 originally included at this point any mention of the promise of land or of the redemption from Egypt. What is clear is that, for whatever reason, the composer
appears to shift from following Exod 6:3–4 to following Gen 17:7. The following table illustrates the composite nature of frag. 4 6–7. 86

TABLE 2.4
COMBINATION OF GENESIS 17 AND EXODUS 6 IN 4Q158 FRAG. 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gen 17:7–8</th>
<th>Exod 6:3–7</th>
<th>4Q158 frag. 4 6–7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>וברית</td>
<td>ואל אברhim אל הגרים ואל עקבי באל שרי ושמיה הוה לא נועדו הים</td>
<td>ושכית את בריית אברhim ואל השכית את ברהין אברhim ואל לאלהים את אברhim ואל אברhim אל והקמחי את ברהין אברhim ואל לאלהים את</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>저는 לבני לעלם</td>
<td>להם להבת ולברית</td>
<td>להם להבת ולברית הלצתם [הלצתם] להבת ולברית</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וברית</td>
<td>ואל אברhim אל האשים ואל</td>
<td>ואל אברhim אל האשים ואל</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lacunae in the manuscript do not allow for definitive conclusions regarding precisely how Genesis 17 and Exodus 6 were combined in frag. 4, but what remains is enough to show that the two passages, similar in so many ways, were brought together. In this way, the recollection of the covenant with the patriarchs (Exodus 6) is harmonized with the actual account of the making of that covenant (Genesis 17). Furthermore, the incorporation of this material into the context of Exodus 24 entails an additional level of

86 Standard underlining indicates parallels between Genesis 17, Exodus 6, and 4Q158. Double underlining indicates parallels between Genesis 17 and Exodus 6.
harmonization or “reading-together.” The contents of the ספר התורה of Exod 24:7, the identity of which is never explicitly determined in the MT version, are identified with the covenant concluded with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. By extension, the “Sinaitic covenant,” formally ratified through its public reading and the cultic events associated with it, is deemed identical with—or at least an extension of—God’s previous covenant with Israel.87 The implicit exegetical assertion that there is only one covenant that God made with Israel is remarkably similar to the outlook on this subject found in the book of Jubilees. In that work, instead of speaking of a “Noachic” covenant, an “Abrahamic” covenant, and a “Sinaitic” covenant, the author implies that God made only a single covenant with his chosen people, beginning with Noah, which is periodically renewed.88

2.5 Fragment 5

2.5.1 Transcription and Translation

87 Segal, "Biblical Exegesis," 50.

1. [of the mountain. Now all of Mount Sinai was smoking because YHWH came down upon it in fire, and its smoke rose like the smoke of the kiln, and the whole mountain was shaking terribly, and the sound of the shofar]

2. [continued to increase mightily; Moses would speak and God would answer him with thunder. And YHWH came down upon Mount Sinai, to the top of the mountain, and YHWH summoned Moses to the top of the mountain, and Moses went up to the top of the mountain. And YHWH said to]

3. [Moses, “Go down, warn the people, lest they break through to YHWH to see, and many of them perish. And let even the priests who approach YHWH sanctify themselves lest YHWH burst out against them.”]

4. [And Moses said to YHWH, “The people will not be able to go up to Mount Sinai, for you yourself warned us, saying: cordon off the mountain and sanctify it …]
2.5.2 Notes on Readings

**L. 0:** The trace of a single letter from the next column is visible on the upper left edge of the fragment, on a section of leather that extends farther to the left than other parts of this fragment. All that remains is part of a vertical stroke; thus the letter cannot be identified even tentatively. The horizontal ruling lines make clear that the letter belonged to the line above the first extant line of the main column of this fragment (the letter is too close to the uppermost ruling line to be a ל from the line below).

**L. 1 (Exod 19:17):** בתו התמיד. Allegro reconstructs the ת, but a tiny speck of the bottom left vertical stroke is visible.

**L. 2 (Exod 19:19):** יִשְׂרָאֵל. This is Strugnell’s reading. I can detect no trace of the ל on PAM 43.424, but the bottom tip of the letter is still visible on the original, as well as in PAM 41.313 and 42.619.

**L. 3 (Exod 19:20):** יִרְאֶה. The conclusive top right corner of ר is missing.

**L. 3 (Exod 19:20):** SP has a конце after Exod 19:20; MT, like 4Q158, does not contain a paragraph break.

**L. 4 (Exod 19:22):** שִׁמְךָ. A speck of ink to the right of the ש, visible in PAM 43.424, may be the end of the bottom horizontal stroke of ש. However, this speck is not visible on the original—it may have fallen away, or I may be interpreting the photo incorrectly and in fact no trace of the ש is preserved. Note also that flaking has caused the loss of the bottom portion of the ש.
L. 5 (Exod 19:23): [הגב]. Strugnell reads [לֹּכֶב] (why not as in MT/SP?), but I find no trace of the ל on the original or in the photographs I have examined.

L. 5 (Exod 19:23): [תְּ]. Only the top left “serif” of ת is visible.

L. 5 (Exod 19:23): [שְּתַו]. Allegro and DSSEL read [דְּשַחַר], but three tiny specks are visible that most likely represent the top of ש.

2.5.3 Comments and Textual Notes

There is little evidence that this fragment contained anything other than the text of Exod 19:17–23. Reconstruction according to MT appears to work well everywhere but line 3. Whatever came before the extant text in that line seems to have ended with ר, which does not match MT and most of the other versional evidence, in which Exod 19:20 ends with the words אֶעֶל מַשֶּה. It seems likely that in this fragment v. 20 ended with a short plus attested in some manuscripts of G, [הַר] [רָאָשׁ] אֶעֶל מַשֶּה. However, even reconstructing according to MT would yield a line-length for line 3 that is inconsistent with what can be reconstructed for the rest of the fragment, and adding the plus only exacerbates the problem. Unless we posit substantial additions in the other lines—for which there is no other evidence—it seems that there must have been some kind of minus in line 3. One solution would be simply to omit [הַר] [רָאָשׁ] אֶעֶל מַשֶּה, which yields a verse still ending with ר. We might surmise in this case that the editor felt that it was already sufficiently clear from the foregoing that Moses ascended the mountain; this argument seems possible.
but far from compelling. Haplography would appear to be a much more likely solution, given the repetition in this verse. Indeed, Strugnell notes that several manuscripts of G, as well as several of MT, omit the phrase זכרו יהיה להם השם אל ראש והר, presumably due to an eyeskip (זכרו יהיה על הר סיני יארש הצアクセק אל ראש והר). It can never be more than conjecture, but it is worth noting that omitting this phrase from the reconstruction yields a much more acceptable line length. In any case, given the evidence of variation in the versions, it seems unlikely that 4Q158 preserves any sort of original variant or deliberate alteration in this instance.

L. 2 (Exod 19:19): מִן [MT SP G-F Tg Syr] αἷς φωνεῖ G.

L. 3 (Exod 19:20): שַׁר [MT SP G MT Tg Syr.]

L. 3 (Exod 19:21): יְהוָה MT SP Tg Syr] ὁ θεὸς G.


L. 4 (Exod 19:22): יָרָע MT SP יָרָע Tg Syr.

---

89 Strugnell, "Notes en Marge," 70.

90 One early printed edition has יָסֵק, see Sperber ad loc.
‫‪2.6 Fragment 6‬‬

‫קרב [ ֯אתה ]ושמע את כול אשר יואמר יהוה אלוהינו ואתה תדבר אלינו את כול אשר ידבר יהוה אלוהינו‬
‫‪] 1‬‬
‫ידב ֯ר ֯ע]מנו אלוהים פן נמות ויאמר מושה אל העם אל תיראו כי לבעבור נסות אתכמה‬
‫̇‬
‫‪] 2‬אליכה ושמענו ועשינו ול[ו̇ א‬
‫יראת]ו על פניכמה לבלתי תחטאו ויעמוד העם מרחוק ומושה נגש אל הערפל אשר שם‬
‫בור תהיה ֯‬
‫הא]לוהים ובע[ ֯‬
‫‪ 3‬בא ֯‬
‫מוש ֯ה ל]אמור שמעתי את קול דברי העם הזה אשר דברו אליכה היטיבו כול אשר דברו מי יתן‬
‫‪ 4‬האלהים ]וידבר [יהוה אל ֯‬
‫‪ 5‬והי̇ ̇ה הלבב הזה להמה ליראה ]אותי ולשמור את מצותי כול הימים למען ייטב להמה ולבניהמה לעולם ???‬
‫‪ 6‬את קול דברי אמו]ר[ ̇להמה נביא ]אקים להמה מקרב אחיהמה כמוכה ונתתי דברי בפיו ודבר אליהמה את כול אשר אצונו והיה האיש‬
‫ישמע] א[ל ֯ד ֯ב ֯ר]יו אשר ידבר בשמי אנוכי אדרוש מעמו אך הנביא אשר יזיד לדבר דבר בשמי את אשר לוא צויתיו‬
‫̇‬
‫‪֯ 7‬אשר לוא‬
‫אשר י֯ ֯ד]בר בשם אלוהים אחרים ומת הנביא ההואה וכי תואמר בלבבכה איך נודע את הדבר אשר לוא דברו יהוה‬
‫֯‬
‫‪] 8‬לד[בר או‬
‫֯‬
‫‪] 9‬א[ ֯שר‬
‫ידבר] הנביא בשם יהוה לוא יהיה הדבר ולוא יבוא הואה הדבר אשר לוא דברו יהוה בזדון דברו הנביא לוא תגור ממנו‬
‫‪ [ ] 10‬ל??]‬

‫‪72‬‬

‫‪2.6.1 Transcription and Translation‬‬


1. “You [approach and listen to everything that YHWH our God shall say, and then you can speak to us everything which YHWH our God speaks]

2. [to you, and we will listen and obey. But do not let God speak with us, lest we die.” Moses said to the people, “Do not be afraid, for it is in order to test you that]

3. God has come, [and in order that the fear of him might be upon you, so that you do not sin.” But the people stood at a distance, and Moses approached the thick darkness where]

4. God was. And ]YHWH [spoke to Moses saying, “I have heard the sound of this people’s words which they spoke to you; everything which they spoke is appropriate. If only]

5. they had this mind, to fear [me and to keep my commands forever, so that it might go well for them and for their descendants forever. .... ]

6. the sound of my words. Say to them: A prophet [like yourself I shall raise up for them from among their kin, and I will put my words in his mouth, and he will speak to them everything that I command him. And the man]

7. who does not heed [his] words, which he spoke in my name—I myself will require it of him. But the prophet who presumes to speak a word in my name which I did not command him]

8. [to speak, or who speaks in the name of other Gods—that prophet shall die. And if you say to yourself: How can we know the word which YHWH did not speak (but]

9. [which the prophet speaks in the name of YHWH? If the thing does not happen or come to be, that is a word which YHWH has not spoken; the prophet spoke it presumptuously. You shall not be afraid of him.]

10. [ ]

2.6.2 Notes on Readings

This fragment is damaged, distorted, and crisscrossed by tears; in most of the photographs, it appears as four separate pieces.

L. 2 (Exod 20:19): This section of the fragment is badly damaged and distorted. A small trace of ink above and to the left of ידבר (the end of which is itself compressed almost beyond recognition) may represent the righthand stroke of בּ. These last few letters are most legible on PAM 41.803.

L. 3 (Exod 20:20): Only the bottom of the ר is preserved, at the edge of a tear in the leather.
**L. 3 (Exod 20:20):** יְרֵאָתָן. A crease or ridge where the leather is bunched together obscures most of the י, but part of the vertical stroke is visible to the right of the crease (most clearly on PAM 41.803).

**L. 4 (Exod 20:21):** קְצֵּץָא. MT has a נ after this word, while SP has a קְצֶץָא. There may have been room in the following lacuna for a very short interval, but it is difficult to be certain.

**L. 4 (Exod 20:21b SP):** [לֹא] יִדְבָּר. Allegro and Strugnell both transcribe the י (Allegro with a circlet; Strugnell as certain). However, the spot of ink that they seem to identify as the bottom of the י appears very clearly on the original to be the top of a ל, from the word לָבָב in the line below. No other trace is visible to me that might represent the י, so I have elected to reconstruct the letter.

**L. 4 (Exod 20:21b SP):** מַשְׁחֵה. A crease obscures most of the final two letters: only the bottom left corner and perhaps the top right corner of ש are preserved. The bottoms of the two vertical strokes of ח are visible on one side of the crease, while traces of ink that seem to represent the top of ח are visible farther to the left, above the crease. Parts of the ש are also visible on both sides of the crease, out of alignment due to the bunching caused by the crease.

**L. 6 (Add. + Exod 20:21b SP [= Deut 18:18]):** [לָלֶהֶמָה]. Only the body of the ל is preserved, and none of the tail.

**L. 7 (Exod 20:21b SP [= Deut 18:19]):** אֶשְׁרָא. Only the top right corner of א is preserved.
L. 7 (Exod 20:21b SP [= Deut 18:19]): רָבַם. The tops of the first three letters are visible.

L. 8 (Exod 20:21b SP [= Deut 18:20]): בֵּר. Only the tops of the letters marked with circlets are preserved.

L. 9 (Exod 20:21b SP [= Deut 18:22]): יַדָּ. A trace of ink belonging to the ר is visible in PAM 41.803 and 42.619.

L. 10: לָ[. Allegro and subsequent publications read לָ, but it is clear from the photographs that the two (?) unidentifiable letters follow immediately after the ב, which itself is preceded by an empty space. The tops of the following letters are visible in the photos, but they are not identifiable. Subsequent to the latest photos, the leather seems to have deteriorated further, such that only the ב is still legible on the original.

2.6.3 Comments and Textual Notes

Fragment 6 follows the text of Exod 20:19–21 according to the Samaritan version, in which material from Deuteronomy 5 and 18 is inserted into the text of Exodus. (This expanded version is also found in 4QpaleoExodm; unfortunately no textual overlaps are preserved in this section between that ms and 4Q158.) Reconstruction according to SP yields fairly uniform line lengths, making it unlikely that the text of 4Q158 deviated much from SP at this point. Lines 5–6 constitute the one exception to this conclusion, as line 6 presents an otherwise unknown transition from Deut 5:29 to Deut 18:18, a transition that must have begun at the end of line 5. While SP and 4QpaleoExodm move directly from Deut 5:29, God’s wish that the
people be inclined to heed his commands, to YHWH’s promise to raise up a prophet in Deut 18:18, the editor of the text reflected in 4Q158 must have found this transition too abrupt. He seems to bring the focus back to the immediate issue of the people’s unwillingness to hear God’s voice directly: the first words of line 6 are אֲדֹנָי קֹל דָּבָרָי, “the sound of my words,” followed by a command to Moses to serve as intermediary (שמועה ואמור) in the proclamation of his own successor (the “prophet like Moses” of Deuteronomy 18). Strugnell suggests the readings [עַדֶּה לַמֵּתָן יִשְׁמֶעָה אֲדֹנָי קֹל דָּבָרָי], “[And now, so that they might hear] the sound of my words,” and [ועַדֶּה הַנָּשָׁר] [שמועה ואמור אֲדֹנָי קֹל דָּבָר], “[And now, because you have heard] the sound of my words.”

The first of these seems unlikely because קֹל in this context seems to refer to the sound or voice of the speaker—precisely the thing that God is conceding to Moses that the Israelites need not hear (see e.g. Deut 5:25, “If we continue to listen to the voice (קול) of YHWH our God any longer, we shall die”). The second suggestion is more plausible, but another possibility is that God refers precisely to the fact that Israel will not in future hear him speak directly: something along the lines of [שמועה לא ואמור דע] אֲדֹנָי קֹל דָּבָר, “And now, they shall no longer hear the sound of my words.”

All these suggestions are, of course, no more than speculation. The more important point is the addition itself: the editor of 4Q158 was clearly working from a pre-Samaritan copy of the Pentateuch, and took the initiative to undertake a revision

---

91 Raphael Weiss suggests that the two words אֲמָר לַמֵּתָן may have been modeled on the similar command ... in Deut 5:30. This is possible, although Weiss does not address the origin of the rest of the additional material—perhaps he views it as unconnected. See Raphael Weiss, "מסומן ומשמח הי בתי," in Studies in the Text and Language of the Bible (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1970), 319-34, at p. 325.
that improves the text from both a stylistic and a logical point of view. First, the abrupt transition in SP Exod 20:21b from Deut 5:29 to Deut 18:18 is softened.

Second, by clarifying that Moses is commanded by God to convey the following words to the Israelites (“Say to them…”), the editor solves an interpretive problem in Deut 18:18–22. That passage clearly contains legal precepts (vv. 19–22), but there is no hint in Deut 18:16–18 that God intends his words to Moses to be passed on to all the Israelites, as is standard for biblical law (cf. e.g. Deut 5:31 and Exod 21:1). The problem is not solved by the retrojection of the law into the Exodus Sinai narrative in 4QpaleoExodm and SP, where it is simply pasted in without any further changes. The short addition in 4Q158 elegantly resolves the issue by making clear that this set of precepts, like the rest of the Sinaitic revelation, is to be transmitted by Moses to the rest of the people.

L. 2 (Exod 20:19b): אָמֹר SP Tg] וַאֲמֹר MT SP G (מַג) Tgק (early printed ed.).

L. 3 (Exod 20:20): יָדָבָר + πρὸς υἱὸν G לֶבֶנָה Tg.

L. 4 (Exod 20:21a–b SP [= Exod 20:21 + Deut 5:28b]): רָאֹמָר SP] וַיֹאמַר SP MT.

L. 4 (Exod 20:21a–b SP): לַקְנָם SP] > MT G Tg Syr.

L. 5 (Exod 20:21b SP [= Deut 5:29]): לָבַבְּךָּתָּה Tg Syr] לָבַבְּךָּתָּה MT SP

L. 6 (Add. + Exod 20:21b SP [= Deut 18:18]): > MT SP G Tg Syr.

L. 7 (Exod 20:21b SP [= Deut 18:19]): וַיִּשָּׁהְם SP G] כֹּלְּךָּ בֵּרָי MT Tg Syr.
L. 8 (Exod 20:21b SP [= Deut 18:20]): אשר痕迹 MT SP G Tg Syr.

4QDeut′ has part of this verse, but the אשר is missing; Crawford in DJD 14 reconstructs according to MT (לדבר, אשר), but this is not necessary because the two adjoining words are on separate fragments.

L. 9 (Exod 20:21b SP [= Deut 18:22]): לאו MT. The reconstruction follows SP rather than MT at this point because this verse is not present in the MT version of Exodus 20.

L. 9–10 (Exod 20:21b SP [= Deut 18:22] + ?): Deut 18:22 fits very comfortably in the remainder of line 9. What follows in line 10 cannot have followed SP, as SP (Exod 20:21b) moves from the end of Deut 18:22 to Deut 5:30, אמר... לאו, which appears in 4Q158 in frag. 7. Since the first extant lines of frag. 7 contain the end of the Decalogue, the continuation of frag. 6 must have contained some kind of transition (back) to this material. For a full discussion of the sequence of material in frags 6 and 7, see the Comments on frag. 7.

2.7 Fragments 7–9

2.7.1 Transcription and Translation
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לוא
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1. your [father] and your mother[ so that your days might be long upon the soil that YHWH your God is giving to you. You shall not murder. You shall not commit adultery. You shall not steal. You shall not give]
2. false testimony [against] your [neighbor]. You shall not covet [your] neighbor’s wife. [You shall not covet your neighbor’s house, nor his male or female slave, nor his ox, nor his donkey, nor anything that belongs to your neighbor.]
3. And YHWH said to Moses, “Go, tell them: Return to your tents! But you stay here with me, and I will tell you the whole commandment, the statutes]
4. and the ordinances that you will teach them so that they might do them in the land which[ I am giving to them to inherit.” …
5. So each of the people returned to his tents, while Moses remained before [YHWH. YHWH spoke to Moses, saying “Say to the children of Israel: You yourselves]
6. have seen that it was from heaven that I spoke to you. You shall not make[ in my presence gods of silver, and gods of gold you shall not make for yourselves. You shall make for me an earthen altar, and you shall sacrifice]
7. upon it your burnt offerings and your offerings of well-being; your sheep [and your cattle. In every place where I cause my name to be remembered I will come to you and bless you. And if]
8. you make for me [an altar of stones], you shall not build with hewn stones, for (then) [you would raise] your chisel[ upon it and profane it. You shall not go up upon my altar by means of steps, so that your nakedness shall not be uncovered]
9. upon it. These are the ordinances[ which you shall set before them. If you purchase a Hebrew slave, six years shall he serve you, and in the seventh he shall go out free.]
10. [without compensation. If he came alone, alone he shall go out; if he has a wife, his wife shall go out with him. If his master gives him a wife and she bears him sons or daughters, the woman]
11. [and her children shall belong to his master, and he shall go out alone. But if the slave should say, “I love my master, my wife, and my children; I will not go free,”]
12. Then [his master] shall[ bring him before God; he shall bring him to the door or to the doorpost, and his master shall pierce]
13. his ear with an awl[ and he shall serve him forever. Now if a man sells his daughter as a maidservant, she shall not go out as the slaves go out. If her master who has designated her for himself is displeased with her,]
14. [he shall let her be redeemed; [he shall not have the authority to sell her] to[ a foreign nation, since he has treated her unjustly. If he designates her for his son, he shall treat her according to the rule for daughters. If he marries another, he shall not reduce her food, her clothing, or her conjugal rights.]
15. [And if these things he does not do for her, she shall go out without paying, without money. Anyone who strikes a man so that he dies shall be put to death—but as for the person who did not lie in wait but whose hand God caused (to strike), I will appoint a place for you]
16. [to which he can flee. But if a man is so presumptuous to his neighbor as to kill him with forethought, from my altar you shall take him to die. Whoever strikes his father or his mother shall be put to death. Whoever kidnaps
17. [a person and sells him, or he is found in his keeping, shall be put to death.  
Whoever curses his father or his mother shall be put to death. If men quarrel and a  
man [strikes] his neighbor with a stone[ or with his fist, but he does not]  
18. [die but is confined to bed, if he gets up and walks around outdoors upon his staff,  
the one who struck shall be cleared; only he shall pay the cost of his confinement  
and shall have him healed. And if] a man strikes [his] slave [  
19. [or his maidservant with a rod, and he dies under his hand, he shall surely be  
avenged. However, if he survives for a day or two, he is not to be avenged, since  
he is his property. And if] a man strikes [his] slave [  
20. [pregnant woman and a miscarriage occurs, but there is no fatality, (the offender)  
shall pay a fine according to what is determined by the woman’s husband—]he  
shall pay as the judges (determine). [But if there is a fatality, then you shall give a  
life]  
21. [for a life, an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, a hand for a hand, a foot for a  
foot, a burn for a burn, a wound for a wound, a stripe] for[ a stripe…]  

2.7.2 Notes on Readings  

L. 1 (Exod 20:12): [אֶ֣מִּ֖֣כְּ]ַּֽלֹּ. The bottom of the two vertical strokes of what  
must have been a fairly narrow א are visible at the edge of the leather.  

L. 1 (Exod 20:12–16): MT and SP both have paragraph breaks between each  
of the individual commandments in this line. It seems that such spacing was not  
present in 4Q158, since the text fits the available space quite well without any extra  
breaks. Note also the clear absence of a break between commandments in line 2.  

L. 2 (Exod 20:16): [כְּ]ַּֽלֹּ. Only part of the bottom horizontal stroke of כ  
remains.  

L. 2 (Exod 20:16): [שָׁמֵ֣ר]. As with the other verses of the Decalogue, MT  
follows this verse with a ס and SP with a special paragraph mark. 4Q158 does not  
have any extra space after this word.
L. 2 (Exod 20:17): שָׁחַז. Part of the middle stroke of א as well as part of the lower left stroke are visible.


L. 2 (Exod 20:17): [לָזֵעַ]. MT (פ) and SP (قضاء) have a paragraph break after this word. Since line 2 is somewhat shorter than average, it is possible that a break was included in 4Q158 as well.

L. 3 (Exod 20:21b SP): [כָּמָה]. Only a speck representing the right corner of the base of the ה remains.

L. 5 (Add., cf. Deut 5:30): לָאֵהלַי. Damage to the leather has blurred the top of the ה, but the letter is still clearly identifiable.

L. 7 (Exod 20:24): א (1°). A crack and the subsequent pushing together of the leather on either side has obscured the top half of the ה.

L. 8 (Exod 20:25): [חֲרֶבֶךְ. Although Allegro puts the bracket immediately after the final letter of this word, it is clear on the original that there was an empty space after the ה.

L. 9 (Exod 20:26): [עַלַי. All that remains of the first letter is a speck of ink at the top left corner; thus, the SP reading אָלַי is also possible.

L. 9 (Exod 20:26): [עַלַי. The large vacat after this word corresponds to MT ה SP קצָה.

L. 9 (Exod 21:1): א. Only a tiny speck of what is presumably the ר (because of spacing considerations) remains. An earlier, even tinier speck may represent the upper left corner of א or the upper right arm of ش.
L. 9 (Exod 21:1): The top left corner of the ו is fairly clear, but could also feasibly represent ב or ר; of the ש no more than a speck of the top right corner remains. Strugnell implies that he can detect traces of י at the end of the word, but these letters are not visible in the photographs I have examined, and they are certainly no longer present in the original: the leather ends immediately after the trace of ש.

L. 10 (Exod 21:3): About half of the upper stroke of the ב is preserved.

L. 11 (Exod 21:4): Only the tops of the letters are preserved, slightly more so for ] than for ] ל.


L. 13 (Exod 21:6): After this word, MT has a ס and SP a קצב. There is room in line 13 for a short interval, but the line is not unduly short without it.

L. 14 (Exod 21:8): A tiny speck from the bottom horizontal stroke is all that remains of פ.

L. 15 (Exod 21:11): Only the top of the י remains, but the reading is certain.

L. 16 (Exod 21:15): Only a small speck of the ת and an even smaller speck of the י are visible (most clearly on PAM 42.619). The bottom horizontal stroke of מ is preserved, as well as enough of the bottom portion of ר that the reading is certain.

L. 15–16 (Exod 21:11–16): MT has closed paragraph markings (ס) after Exod 21:11, 13, and 14. SP has no corresponding breaks. It is not impossible that breaks appeared at these points in 4Q158, but breaks in these two lines would create additional difficulties for the reconstruction of lines 17–20 (see below).
L. 17 (Exod 21:16–18): MT has כ after Exod 21:16 and 17; SP has a כparagus after 21:17. If one or both of these paragraph breaks were extant in 4Q158, the text of MT/SP would better fit the available space. On the other hand, 4Q158 may have contained additional material at this point (see Comments below).

L. 18–19 (Exod 21:18–22): MT has כparagus after Exod 21:19, 21. Only in the latter case is there a corresponding כparagus in SP. If one or both of these breaks were present in 4Q158, the text of MT/SP would better fit the available space.

L. 20 (Exod 21:22): כparagus. The upper portions of these three letters are preserved in PAM 41.803 (the earliest photo that includes frag. 9); the portion of leather on which they are written must have become detached from the rest of the fragment prior to later photographs.

L. 21 (Exod 21:25): כparagus. Two small traces of ink represent the top of the first כparagus.

2.7.3 Comments and Textual Notes

These three fragments were originally part of a single column. There is no overlap between the fragments, but reconstruction makes clear that they contain between them 21 continuous lines. They reflect the text of Exod 20:12–17 + 20:21b–21:25, according to the text-type reflected in SP, with relatively minor additions.

L. 1–3 (Exod 20:12–17 + Add. + Deut 5:30): The textual sequence attested in these lines presents a conundrum: the people’s request for a mediator and the subsequent discussion (SP Exod 20:18–21b), which in Exodus and Deuteronomy follows the Decalogue, is presented in 4Q158 (frag. 6) as coming before the
Decalogue. Such an arrangement would appear to be nonsensical, given that Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5 imply that it is precisely in response to hearing God speak the Decalogue that the people request that Moses serve as intermediary for further divine speech.

In approaching this problem we must note first of all that the problem most likely cannot be solved by reordering the fragments of 4Q158 such that frag. 6, containing the request for a mediator, would come after the end of the Decalogue in frag. 7. Frag. 7 continues through into the beginning of the Covenant Code (7 9–11 = Exod 21:1–4), and the text of lines 3–5 makes clear that the people’s request for Moses’ mediation has been granted: they are dismissed to their tents and God addresses the Covenant Code to Moses alone. The request for mediation must therefore have come before the beginning of frag. 7; thus frag. 6 and frag. 7 are in the correct order.\footnote{Segal also recognizes that frag. 7–9 cannot come before frag. 6, though for different reasons, which are somewhat unclear. See Segal, "Biblical Exegesis," 56.}

Another issue to consider is that the text of Exodus 19–20 leaves substantial ambiguity as to whether the Decalogue was in fact addressed to the whole people. The request for mediation in Exod 20:18, immediately after the Decalogue, implies that it was, but that verse does not make this explicit, saying only that the people “saw the thunder and the torches and the sound of the shofar and the mountain smoking…” Furthermore, the transition between Exodus 19 and Exodus 20, extremely awkward syntactically and almost certainly the sign of redactional activity, might give the
impression that Moses is recounting God’s words rather than God speaking directly. Thus it may be possible that the editor of the text in 4Q158 regarded the Decalogue as already mediated by Moses according to the text of Exodus, and thus moved it to a more logical position after the request for mediation.

This solution, however, is rendered less plausible by the appearance of a word from Deut 5:27 in frag. 6 line 1. This—plus the text’s adherence to pre-Samaritan traditions elsewhere in the Sinai pericope—strongly suggests that all of Deut 5:24–27 was originally present in 4Q158 preceding frag. 6. If this is indeed the case, it is very difficult to maintain that the editor regarded the Decalogue as entirely mediated to the people through Moses, because Deut 5:24 makes it very clear that the people did not simply hear the roar of thunder and the sound of the shofar, but actually heard God speaking to them: “Today we have seen that God can speak (דרבר) to humans and they can survive.” It seems highly unlikely that the editor would have regarded the Decalogue as mediated entirely by Moses if this verse was included in his pentateuchal Vorlage. For this reason, I do not believe the suggestion by Strugnell,

---

93 The awkwardness results from the juxtaposition of the end of 19:25 with the beginning of 20:1, “and he said to them. And God spoke…” The converted imperfect could be construed as the content of Moses’ speech (“….and he said to them, ‘And God spoke…”’). However, this would require that the converted imperfect lose its normal feature of connecting to what comes before, since it is disconnected from ויאמר as regards both temporal sequence and speaker. Bernard Levinson suggests that the retention of the tensive juxtaposition is intentional, meant to sustain ambiguity as to who the speaker of the Decalogue actually was (personal communication). Arie Toeg makes a similar argument with regard to the lack of reference to any addressee in Exod 20:1—to whom is God speaking? Toeg suggests that the ambiguity is a deliberate attempt on the part of the interpolator of the Decalogue to address the tension between two perspectives already embedded in the text, one of which regarded the Decalogue as the direct speech of YHWH to all the people, and the other of which denied the possibility of any such direct speech. See Arie Toeg, בֵּסִינִי תּוֹרָה מַתְן (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1977), 61-64.

that frag. 6 9 was followed directly by a repetition of the Decalogue, presented as the words of Moses (“And Moses said to the people, ‘YHWH said to me: I am YHWH your God…”), is adequate. But if the Decalogue is not repeated, and the people did hear God speaking directly to them, then what is the end of the Decalogue doing in the beginning of frag. 7?

Michael Segal has proposed an ingenious solution to this problem that takes account of all of these issues. He suggests that 4Q158 reflects a textualization of an interpretive tradition found in later rabbinic material that only the first two commandments were spoken directly by God to the whole people, while the rest were mediated through Moses. This tradition most likely takes its origin from the fact that only the first two commandments refer to God in the first person, while the rest refer to God in the third person. It also seems likely, however, that the confusion in the MT about who speaks the Decalogue to the people could have been an additional influence. In any case, Segal hypothesizes that 4Q158 reflects this tradition in that Exod 20:2–6 were located before the people request a mediator (Exod 20:18–19 SP), while the rest of the commandments, Exod 20:7–17, were moved to a new location towards the end of the long addition in SP labeled Exod 20:21b: after the prophet law from Deuteronomy 18 and before the resumption of Deuteronomy 5 with v. 30, “Go, tell them, ‘return to your tents’ ….” This solution allows for both the presence in frag.

---

95 Strugnell, "Notes en Marge," 172.
97 Segal, "Biblical Exegesis," 57 n. 35.
6 of Deut 5:24, with its record that God spoke to Israel directly, and the location of
the (end of the) Decalogue after the request for mediation.

One issue Segal does not consider is who the speaker of the Decalogue is in
the beginning of frag. 7. As we have seen, Strugnell suggests that the speaker is
Moses, here repeating to the people words presumably spoken earlier to him alone.
Strugnell cites as evidence the addition that appears at the beginning of line 3: "ויאמר
יוסף אל יהוה..." And YHWH said to Moses..." This phrase might represent a change
of speaker, suggesting that Moses had indeed been speaking in the immediately prior
portion of text. If line 3 indicates that Moses is the speaker of the Decalogue here, it
seems necessary to assume that whatever part of the Decalogue that Moses here
relates to the people was already presented at some point earlier in the text; otherwise,
Moses would be presenting laws (and not just any laws!) that there was no explicit
record of him receiving from God. This in no way precludes Segal’s basic
understanding of the passage; it just means that between frags 6 and 7 there would
have been both an account of God relating commandments 3–10 to Moses and an
account of Moses relaying these commandments to the people.


99 It should be noted that Segal does not consider it plausible that the Decalogue was
presented twice in this section, as Strugnell implies was the case, because “the close proximity of the
two appearances negates this option”; see Segal, "Biblical Exegesis," 56 n. 32. This judgment seems
too hasty given the general tendency of texts related to SP towards repetition in order to emphasize that
a command was fulfilled or an event correctly remembered. (For examples, see section 5.2 below.)
Segal does not consider the possibility that only the latter part of the Decalogue might have been
repeated, but presumably he would consider the proximity of the two occurrences to be too close in
this case as well.
It is not entirely clear, however, that Strugnell’s interpretation of the addition in line 3 is the correct one; I do not think it proves that Moses was the speaker of the part of the Decalogue that ends in lines 1–2. Strugnell suggests, quite plausibly, that the phrase serves to mark a change in speaker. Equally, however, the phrase could mark a change in *addressee*. The Decalogue is full of second-person singular verb forms and object suffixes: it is addressed to an individual “you” that represents each individual Israelite (or, alternatively, the nation as a whole). But God’s speech immediately following the Decalogue in 4Q158 frag. 7 is also formulated in the second-person singular, now addressed not to the entire nation but to Moses alone: לך אמר להמה... Going straight from one to the other would have created confusion as to who is being addressed by the imperative לך. The addition of the short introductory phrase alleviates this problem.

In sum, I think that Segal’s suggestion for understanding the relationship between frags 6 and 7 is as certainly correct as such a conjectural suggestion can be; after all, there is no physical evidence that the first two commandments were located prior to frag. 6. The issue of whether the final eight commandments appeared only once in 4Q158, as divine speech to Moses, or twice, once as divine speech and once as Mosaic speech, is less clear. Evidence that this material too appeared only once might be seen in the fact that none of the other divine commands in this section (e.g. the prophet law of Deuteronomy 18 or the Covenant Code) are understood as relayed to the people at this point; rather, from the perspective of the narrative, their repetition is presumably delayed until the plains of Moab.
L. 2 (Exod 20:17): וְלֹא תַחֲמוּ אֶשְׁתֵּךְ אָשֵׁת G [בִּית בֵּית SP Tg Syr (cf. Deut 5:21 אָשֵׁת לא אָשֵׁת רָעָךְ)].

L. 2 (Exod 20:17): וְאֵלֶּה תַחֲמוּ אֶשְׁתֵּךְ SP. Note that SP, with its extra word, appears to fill the available space better than MT.

L. 3 (Add. + Exod 20:21b [= Deut 5:30]): [וַיָּאָמְרוּ יְהוָה אָלֶּה אֵלֶּה ] > MT SP G Tg Syr.


L. 5 (Add. + Exod 20:22): Line 5 contains an otherwise unattested report that the instructions given by God to Moses in Deut 5:30 (frag. 7 3) were in fact fulfilled. Exactly how this report was introduced by additional new material at the end of line 4 is unclear. The line as reconstructed according to Deut 5:31 certainly leaves space for additional material, and it is possible that that space contained a report of Moses’ fulfillment of YHWH’s command to him (וַיָּאָמְרוּ לְמָר לָהָם...), something along the lines of וַיָּאָמְרוּ נָשָּׁה וְלָכֹּה לָכֹּה לָכֹּה לָכֹּה לָכֹּה לָכֹּה לָכֹּה לָכֹּה. Such an addition seems almost necessary in light of the people’s compliance to the command as recorded in line 5. The extant part of line 5 itself is constructed on the basis of God’s command in Deut 5:30–31: the people are to return to their tents and Moses is to remain standing before God. The reconstruction לָכֹּה, followed immediately by Exod 20:22, is of course only conjecture. Presuming, however, that all of Exod 20:22 was in fact originally part of lines 5–6, there is little room in line 5 for very much more material.
The addition in lines 4–5 seems to be another example of what was observed with regard to frag. 6 6: the editor of the composition reflected in 4Q158 has taken steps to improve the logic and clarity of the expanded edition of the Exodus narrative familiar from SP. In SP, the text of Exodus 20 proceeds directly from Deut 5:30–31 (וְדָבַר יְהוָה אֲלֵּֽךָ לֵאמֹר יָאָדֵֽנִי פָּהוּ...עָמַדְתָּ...וַאֲתָה...), and from there directly into the Covenant Code. God never stops talking, according to SP, from Exod 20:21b (= Deut 5:28) until Exod 24:3. In other words, Moses never has a chance to fulfill the command God gives him in Deut 5:30, “Go, tell them, ‘return to your tents’.”

The editor of our text inserts a narrative report of the fulfillment of the command precisely where it most logically belongs, at the point where the long insertion of material from Deuteronomy ends and the SP tradition returns to the text of Exodus 20.

Furthermore, the narrative addition brackets the Deuteronomy insertion and marks it off as a unit of divine speech to Moses separate from that which follows. In effect, it creates a repetitive resumption that “resets” the Exodus narrative to the point it was at before the long addition of the Deuteronomy material. This can be seen through the parallels between the addition in 4Q158 7–9 and the last verse prior to the insertion in Exodus, 20:21:

100 Note that the lack of explicit fulfillment is not a problem in the original Deuteronomic setting of the verse, because the setting there is Moses’ recollection, on the plains of Moab, of the events at Horeb. This recollection is interwoven with Moses’ “present-day” adjurations to the Israelites; thus in Deut 5:32 it is Moses, not God, who is speaking to the Israelites.

101 Ironically, 4Q158 here uses a technique otherwise attested most frequently in the Samaritan tradition, that of ensuring that commands are accompanied by reports of their fulfillment; see e.g. Exod 7:14–18 in SP and 4QpaleoExod. On this technique, see Emanuel Tov, "The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts," *JSOT* 31 (1985): 3-29, at p. 7. See also below, section 5.2.
TABLE 2.5
A NEW “WIEDERAUFNAHME” IN 4Q158 FRAG. 7–9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exod 20:21</th>
<th>4Q158 7–9 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>So the people stood at a distance, And Moses approached the thick cloud where God was.</td>
<td>So the people returned, each to their tents, And Moses stood before [YHWH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the addition in 4Q158 cannot technically be called a repetitive resumption or *Wiederaufnahme* because it does not take its formulation from Exod 20:21 but from Deut 5:30–31, it seems to serve the same function: it returns the text’s audience to the point in the narrative precisely before the interruption—here, the addition of material from Deuteronomy in SP and related texts—occurred. In Exod 20:21, the people are removed to a distance while Moses approaches God, and precisely this same thing happens according to the addition: the people return to their tents, and Moses stands before God. What is striking is that this bracketing apparently did not take place at the time of the original insertion, but at a later stage in the process of transmission. The editor of the text in 4Q158 has taken what was essentially a mechanical juxtaposition of passages on the part of an earlier editor and improved its logic and coherence, operating at least to some extent within the realm of recognizable scribal procedures.

L. 5 (Exod 20:22): The reconstruction here follows SP because of 4Q158’s general adherence to SP throughout Exod 20:18–22.
L. 7 (Exod 20:24): עלותיכו MT SP Tg Syr.

L. 7 (Exod 20:24): שלמותך G MT SP Tg Syr.

L. 7 (Exod 20:24): זאת צאנך MT Syr Tg b-g (both early editions) SP Tg.

L. 9 (Exod 21:1): אלהי G MT SP Tg Syr.

L. 10 (Exod 21:3): בגפו MT SP Syr Tg.

L. 10 (Exod 21:3): בא MT SP Tg Syr.

L. 11 (Exod 21:4): לאדניה MT 1QExod Tg SP. Note for comparison that 4QpaleoExodm has אדונו in Exod 21:6 (twice) where MT SP have לאדניו.

L. 12 (Exod 21:6): Reconstruction according to MT/SP yields a line that is much shorter than others in this column. It seems that there must have been some sort of addition. As Strugnell notes, the alternative—that there was a major omission of material from Exod 21:5–6—is impossible, since this would require that the two letters preserved on the first line of frag. 8 (ו֯ה֯) fit into the beginning of line 11 as part of the biblical text immediately preceding לאדניה (MT Tg). Since the two letters are at the right margin of the column, they must have been the first two letters of a word. However, the remnants of the letters—three vertical strokes—are not consistent

102 Strugnell, "Notes en Marge," 173.
with the beginnings of any of the words in Exod 21:4 prior to לאדונו. Therefore, it
seems that the first line of frag. 8 must represent the line following לאדונו, with the
result that that line (line 12) must have contained more material than the text of
MT/SP. Since the extant text in this section exhibits only minor variation from the
pentateuchal text as known from MT and SP, it is difficult even to speculate about the
contents of this addition.

L. 13 (Exod 21:8): [אס רעה] MT + SP.

L. 15 (Exod 21:11): I have construed the single extant letter as belonging to
the word שלשה in Exod 21:11. However, it is also possible to read it as belonging to
the previous phrase, והנהו (Exod 21:10), as Allegro and DSSEL do. The
only implication would be that, because of the three extra words that must now be
fitted into lines 15–16, frag. 9 would be located slightly farther towards the left
margin of our reconstructed column.

L. 16–21 (Exod 21:15–25): The reconstruction shows that, when
reconstructed according to MT/SP, most of the lines in frag. 9 are slightly shorter than
most of the lines in frags 7–8. However, line 18 is approximately as long as most of
the lines in this column, and line 21 certainly could be. (The precise length of line 21
is difficult to determine, because the single preserved word,תחת, occurs repeatedly in
the relevant portion of the biblical text.) Furthermore, lines 19 and 20 are shorter than
average by only a few letter-spaces. Given the variation in amount of space left
between words in this column and the possible presence of paragraph breaks (see
Notes on Readings above), there is probably no need to posit any kind of additional
material for these lines; more likely, there was simply a greater amount of space
between words. On the other hand, the text of MT/SP falls short by several words of
the available space in the lacuna between lines 16 and 17. Two relatively simply
solutions present themselves. First, there may have been a particularly large interval
before the beginning of Exod 21:18 (וְיהָרָבֹנ) in line 17 (MT ס = SP קָפֵשׁ). Second,
G presents a variant reading in Exod 21:17 (= MT 21:16):

גֶּנֶב וּמָרְכַּר גוֹנָב MT SP]
G יִדְּחַ מִלְּכָה יִתְהַמַּר אֲחֵי יִשְּרָאֵל וּמָרְכַּר

perhaps lines 16–17 reflected some or all of this expanded reading, e.g. מָרְכַּר וּגְנַב יִשְּרָאֵל...

“Whoever kidnaps anyone from among the children of Israel and enslaves him or sells him…” 103
However, both of these solutions are speculation, and it is equally possible that the lacuna in lines 16–17 contained a short
addition of otherwise unknown material.

L. 16 (Exod 21:16): גנֶב MT SP Tg.

L. 17 (Exod 21:18): מבּו MT G Tg Syr > SP (omits בּאָבָה או בּאָבָה).


L. 20 (Exod 21:22): פְּלֵילְיָמ הַפְּלֵילֵי מִן פְּלֵילְיָמ MT SP 4QpaleoExod G מְעָרָה

אָמַרְמָה Tg Syr.

103 Note that Exod 21:17 G seems to reflect a partial harmonization to Deut 24:7, איש יִמָּצָא כֻּבוֹר וּגְנַב בּוֹ וּתְחַמֶּר יִשְׂרָאֵל וַאֲחֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל...

“If a man is found to have kidnapped anyone of his kin from among the children of Israel, and enslaved him or sold him…”

104 Note G transposes vv 16 and 17, thereby grouping the two laws involving parents.
2.8 Fragments 10–12

2.8.1 Transcription and Translation
ויכרה איש בור ויתן שלם.  

1 ויתן שלם איש בור, 2 ואיש בור ויתן שלם.  

3 ואיש בור ויתן שלם, 4 ואשי בור ויתן שלם.  

5 ואיש בור ויתן שלם. 6 ואיש בור ויתן שלם.  

7 ואיש בור ויתן שלם. 8 ואיש בור ויתן שלם.  

9 ואיש בור ויתן שלם. 10 ואיש בור ויתן שלם.  

11 ואיש בור ויתן שלם. 12 ואיש בור ויתן שלם.  

13 ואיש בור ויתן שלם.
1. thirty pieces of silver [he shall give to his master, and the ox shall be stoned. And if a man opens a cistern or if a man digs a cistern and he does not cover it, and an ox or a donkey falls into it.]

2. [the owner] of the cistern shall make recompense; he shall pay money to its owner, and the dead animal shall be his. And if one man’s ox gores his neighbor’s ox and it dies, they shall sell the live ox and divide its price, and also the dead one they shall divide. [If it is known that it was an ox prone to goring in the past, and its owner has not guarded it, he shall make recompense, an ox in place of an ox.]

3. [and the dead animal shall be] his. [If a man steals an ox or a sheep and slaughters it or sells it, he shall repay five oxen in place of the ox and four sheep in place of the sheep.]

4. [If the thief is discovered while breaking in] and is struck and dies, there is no bloodguilt in the case. If the sun has risen upon him, there is bloodguilt for the case. He shall surely make recompense. If he is unable, he shall sell himself for his theft. If [the stolen property is found in his possession, whether ox or] donkey or sheep, still alive, he shall repay each twofold. And if [a man grazes [a field or vineyard and he sends out his herd and it grazes in the field] of another, he shall make recompense from his own field according to its output. If he causes the entire field to be grazed over, the best of his field and the best of his vineyard he shall repay. If fire breaks out and catches in thorns and stacked grain or the standing grain or the field is consumed, the one who started the fire shall make recompense. If a man gives to [his neighbor money or tools to watch over and they are stolen from the man’s house, if the thief is found he shall repay]

5. [each thing double. If the thief is not found, the owner] of the house [shall draw near before God (and swear) that he has not laid his hand upon the property of his neighbor. In every case of wrongdoing involving an ox or]

6. [a donkey or a sheep or a garment or any lost item] about which one party says “that is it!,” the dispute between the two of them shall come before YHWH. The one whom God declares guilty shall repay each thing double.

7. [to his neighbor. If a man gives to his neighbor a donkey] or an ox or a sheep or any animal to watch over and [it dies or is injured or is carried off, without anyone seeing, there shall be an oath to YHWH]

8. [between the two of them that (the one) did not lay his hand] upon the property of his neighbor, and its owner shall accept the oath and (the other) shall not make recompense. But if [it was stolen [from him he shall make recompense to its owner. If it was torn by a wild animal, he should bring it as evidence; he need not make recompense for the remains. And if a man borrows an animal [from] his neighbor [and it is injured or dies, its] owner …
2.8.2 Notes on Readings

L. 1 (Exod 21:32): כְּסִף. Only a tiny speck of the כ is visible off the upper right corner of ס.

L. 1 (Exod 21:32): [סְכָפָל]. After this word, MT has a כ and SP a קפז. A paragraph break at this point in 4Q158 is not out of the question, although it seems unlikely because the result would be a rather long line.

L. 2 (Exod 21:34): ישְּלִם. Only the top right corner of ש is preserved.

L. 2 (Exod 21:34): [רְוֵיה]. After these words, MT has a ר and SP a קפז. Since line 2 is somewhat short as reconstructed (without an interval), perhaps this break was also present in 4Q158.

L. 3 (Exod 21:36): אָמ. Allegro reads אָמ [פ, with a space between the edge of the ms and the first letter. This is clearly incorrect based on the photographs. As Strugnell notes, the correct placement is important in this case because it allows for the possibility of the variant reading ואמ (see also line 4).\(^{105}\)

L. 3 (Exod 21:36): [ש]. Only the bottom horizontal stroke of the כ remains.

L. 3 (Exod 21:36): [ש]. Traces of the bottoms of two vertical strokes are visible above the word שור in line 4. Allegro and DSSEL read these as ו[ט; however, there are only 3 or at the most 4 letter-spaces between the preserved remains of ו and the marks in question. Thus it seems much more likely that the traces represent the ו of שור. Another possibility would be to read והמ [ב or [ת] in

\(^{105}\) Strugnell, "Notes en Marge," 174.
accordance with SP (see Comments below). It is very difficult to be certain, but both of these solutions seem less likely than [ש: the space between the כ and the trace letter(s) seems too long for כ but too short for כ]. Since ש is a very wide letter in this manuscript, it would probably fit the available space better.

L. 4 (Exod 21:36): [ו]. As Strugnell notes, the top of the כ is partially preserved below הנ in line 3.

L. 4 (Exod 21:36): [ר]. After this word, MT has a כ and SP a כ. As the reconstruction indicates, an interval at this point in 4Q158 would allow the MT/SP text to fill the available space.

L. 4 (Exod 21:37): [א]. Two small specks represent the lower right corner of א and the bottom of כ, while the bottom horizontal stroke of כ is preserved.

L. 5 (Exod 22:2): [ה]. A crease runs through the ה, obscuring the left vertical stroke. This stroke can still be seen in the original on the raised edge of the crease.

L. 6 (Exod 22:3): [ש]. The bottom stroke of the כ is complete obscured by the same crease that runs through the ה of ה in the line above.

L. 6 (Exod 22:3): [ישלמ]. There is a clear interval after this word (corresponding to כ in MT and כ in SP), which is not noted by Allegro or DSSEL.

L. 7 (Exod 22:4): [מחטב]. Strugnell suggests that the superlinear letter may be a כ for the reading כמחטב, which Strugnell compares to the Syr reading כמחטב. Hebrew כמחטב. It is unlikely, however, that the preposition כ in its prefix form would
have been written with a ב. More likely, the copyist construed the word as a hiphil participial form from בת.

**L. 7 (Exod 22:4):** יְשַׁלֵּם. After this word MT has a ס, although SP has no paragraph break. There is room for a break in 4Q158, although it is not necessary to fill the available space.

**L. 8 (Exod 22:5):** המבער. Allegro and DSSEL read המבער, and indeed it is difficult to find any trace of the י in the hole that obscures part of the ע and the top of the ר (contra Strugnell, who maintains that “on lit clairement המבער”). However, there is a tiny speck visible to the right of the י that could represent part of the י. There also seems to be too much space between the ע and ה if no additional letter intervened: in 4Q158, the longer diagonal stroke of ע usually touches or comes very close to the following letter if that letter has a right vertical stroke (cf. e.g. יבעה in frag. 10–12 6, and עולם and עולם in frag. 1–2 9).

**L. 8 (Exod 22:5):** המבערה. After this word, MT has a ס and SP a קצף.

Although the gap between this word and the next in 4Q158 is perhaps slightly larger than average, it does not appear to represent a paragraph break. (Compare the clear vacat in line 6, and note the variability of space between words throughout the manuscript.)

**L. 9 (Exod 22:7):** מִמְּלָאתָהוּ. Only the bottom right corner of the ב remains.

---

106 The normal form would be *mittub*, with the assimilated nun reflected in the doubled tet. Qimron indicates that “[p]lene spelling for short i is extremely rare” in the Dead Sea Scrolls. See Elisha Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (HSS 29; Atlanta: Scholars, 1986), 19.

L. 10 (Exod 22:8): א֯שְׁר (1°). A tiny speck on the edge of the leather about halfway down the following ש must represent part of the left leg of א, which Allegro and DSSEL reconstruct completely. (The dark spot visible on PAM 43.424 near the top of the ש is not visible on the original; if it is ink it may represent the top left corner of the א: in this ms the left leg often protrudes much farther to the left than the top corner of the long middle stroke.)

L. 10 (Exod 22:8): כי ההואה וה. These words were originally omitted by the copyist, and were added above the line. Both Allegro and DSSEL transcribe כי as כיא, though the א is definitely not present.

L. 10 (Exod 22:8): א֯שְׁר (2°). A tiny speck on the edge of the leather is all that remains of the א (top right corner). Allegro and DSSEL do not note this trace.

L. 11 (Exod 22:8): [לִדְרַע]. After this word MT has a ס and SP a קפצו. A paragraph break at this point in 4Q158 would nicely fit the available space.

L. 11 (Exod 22:9): לִשְׁמָהָ. The tops of the last three letters are visible, limiting the options for alternative readings.

L. 11 (Exod 22:9): ק. On the far left edge of the fragment, a straight vertical stroke is visible, consistent with the ק of מנה. Allegro and DSSEL do not note this letter.

L. 12 (Exod 22:10): רֶעֶת. The last two letters are very faint on the original and on PAM 43.424, but almost all of the ר and the diagnostic top of the ה are preserved. The letters appear darker and clearer on PAM 41.803 and 42.619.
L. 12 (Exod 22.11): יִנְחָם. Only part of the short leg of ג remains, but enough is preserved to rule out everything else except ט.

L. 13 (Exod 22:12): ישֶלֶם. MT has a paragraph break after this word (פ), although SP does not. A slight vacat in 4Q158 at this point would fit the available space well, but is not necessary.

L. 13 (Exod 22:13): והם. Only the extreme tops of the three letters are visible. There is a tiny speck to the left of what appears to be the thick central stroke of the כ, which does not seem to be consistent with כ. On the other hand, it does not suggest any other letter either. Perhaps it is simply an unintentional drop of ink, such as that visible below the ב of בַּמְלָא in line 12.

L. 13 (Exod 22:13): בהם. A large tear in the leather runs diagonally through this word, such that the ב is visible below the tear, the final ה above the tear, and ה in the middle on either side of the tear.


2.8.3 Comments and Textual Notes

These three fragments combine to present the text of Exod 21:32–22:13 with no substantial additions or alterations.

L. 1–3 (Exod 21:32–36): It is of course possible that these lines should be reconstructed according to SP instead of MT; because there are so many alterations I have simply presented both possible reconstructions above. Reconstructing according to SP, however, yields line lengths for lines 1 and 2 that are ca. 20 letter spaces longer
than the average for this fragment. There is also some textual evidence that frag. 10–12 reflected the MT in lines 1–3. First, it should be noted that all of the SP expansions in Exod 21:28–22:3 reflect a single exegetical move, the expansion of the application of the law from the specific animals mentioned to any animal, כל בהמה. It is most likely, therefore, that all these changes were made at the same time. If the version of Exodus that lies behind 4Q158 had any of these changes, it is likely to have had all of them. In light of this observation, it is significant that, at the only point in this fragment where the relevant text is extant, 4Q158 does not contain the SP plus: line 6 reads, with MT, leven הש עד בהמה והימים, while SP has leven הש עד_bm網絡. Thus, despite the agreement in this fragment with other SP pluses (such as the one in line 7, which, however, is also present in G), lines 1–3 should probably be reconstructed according to MT. Another possible, supporting piece of evidence occurs in line 3, where I argue tentatively that the reading שור fits the space better than the SP reading בהמה. Because this reading is so tentative, however, it cannot be given much weight.

L. 3 (Exod 21:36): שׁוֹר אָס {אֲנָֽן} Syr אָס MT SP Tg.

L. 4 (Exod 21:37): {אָס} Syr. It seems that there was an interval between Exod 21:36 and 21:37, corresponding to the closed paragraph marker (ס) in the MT and the קצה in SP. The presence of אס at the beginning of Exod 21:37 instead of כי as in MT indicates that, to the person

108 Note that the set of expansions with כל בהמה also appears to be absent from 4QpaleoExod (col. 23); see DJD 9:104. The absence of the pluses from two early witnesses implies that this particular set of changes originated fairly late in the transmission history of the pre-Samaritan version of Exodus.
responsible for this change, the Covenant Code’s careful separation of the two conditionals by role was no longer understood. In the Covenant Code, כי is always used to introduce the main protasis of a casuistic law, whereas אם introduced subconditions.109

L. 5 (Exod 22:1): והכהו MT G Tg Syr SP.

L. 5 (Exod 22:1–2): (bis) 4Q366 1 MT Dems SP Tg.

L. 5 (Exod 22:2): והנה MT Syrرح SP. It is interesting to note that 4Q158 agrees with MT against SP in several details in this line.

L. 6 (Exod 22:3): אשים את הים SP Tg SyrSHARE MTシェシェ מים. It is interesting to note that 4Q158 agrees with MT against SP in several details in this line.

L. 6 (Exod 22:3): אחד MT G Syr SP Tg G-abs MT G.

L. 6 (Exod 22:3): שנブラック G.

L. 6 (Exod 22:4): ובך MT SP G Syr רככ מים MT Tg.

L. 6 (Exod 22:4): ובך MT SP. 4Q158 reflects a continuation of the apparent impulse, evident in SP, to avoid the root בכר to refer to destruction by grazing cattle in Exod 22:4.110 While SP retains בכר in the opening clause of the law

---


110 Aejmelaeus’s argument that בכר may be the original reading, later corrupted to בכר on the basis of the word בכר, “cattle,” later in the verse, strikes me as implausible; see Anneli Aejmelaeus, "What Can We Know about the Hebrew Vorlage of the Septuagint?,” ZAW 99 (1987): 59-89, at pp. 82-83. The main problem with this suggestion is the witness of SP, which uses בכר in the plus but בכר in
and only shifts to the less ambiguous בעה in the plus (אוס Malone héšad bâhô), 4Q158 reads בעה at the opening of the law as well.111

L. 6 (Exod 22:4): בעה 4Q366 1 MT SP. Since 4Q158 uses בעה instead of בער twice elsewhere in this law, it is reasonable to assume that it did so here as well.

L. 7 (Exod 22:4): את ספ 4Q366 1 SP כותבומוה אוס כל ההשדב בעה (G) abs MT Tg Syr.

L. 7 (Exod 22:4): את ספ לות 6 G. Citing grammatical reasons and the SP reading את, Strugnell argues that this line reads את rather than את because of

both instances where it occurs in MT. If בעה was found in his Vorlage, it is highly unlikely that the editor responsible for the form of SP would have used בעה in the extra legal condition but changed בעה to בער elsewhere in the law. Of course one could assume that the corruption in MT occurred after the SP tradition split off, and then SP was subsequently corrected back towards MT, but in that case we would expect SP to read בער in all cases, not just once. That the longer version of G and SP represents the original form of the text is unlikely, as Aejmelaeus admits: there is no plausible reason why the extra condition would be omitted. Thus, in this case, the principle of lectio difficilior seems appropriate: it is much easier to explain the move from the confusing בער to the less confusing בעה than the reverse. Furthermore, the reading of 4Q366, which contains the plus but reads בעה throughout, may represent the earliest form of the plus. If this is the case, it is even less likely that בעה would have been the original reading. See further the following note.

111 It should be noted that G uses the same verb, καταβάομαι, in all three places. It is therefore possible that it reflects a Vorlage that read בעה throughout, and that this reading was also in the Vorlage of 4Q158. We can never know for sure that 4Q158 had בעה throughout, because the second occurrence of the verb is not extant, but the two extant uses make the third very likely. On the other hand, the translator may have had a Vorlage that read בער throughout: this reading appears to be attested in 4Q366 (see below, pp. 197–98). The evidence of 4Q366 may mean that the plus in its original form had בער, which was subsequently changed to בעה in a Vorlage of SP. Alternatively, perhaps a later copyist of the SP version, which has both בעה and בער, was more troubled by the inconsistency in language than by the ambiguity of בער and changed the one occurrence of בעה to בער. It is even possible, though perhaps less likely, that the G translator had a Vorlage like SP and simply used a single Greek word to translate the two Hebrew roots, thus indicating that he understood them as synonymous. This would be consistent with the general sensitivity to both Greek and Hebrew usage that has been noted in the LXX translation of Exodus; see Aejmelaeus, "Hebrew Vorlage," 71-77.
haplography). However, there is no compelling grammatical reason that one would want אם instead of ואם to introduce a legal subcondition here. It therefore seems impossible to determine whether omission of the ואם was deliberate or accidental (even if it was accidental, the frequent variation between ואם and אם, as well as בין and ואם, suggests that carelessness or a mental slip may be as likely as haplography). L. 7 (Exod 22:4): MT SP Tg ומשה. ל G = ואם.

L. 8 (Exod 22:6):HEMA Tg] י Priest SP G Syr. This line, if reconstructed according to MT/SP, is substantially longer than others in this column. No obvious solution presents itself; perhaps one might guess that material was accidentally omitted due to an eyeskip involving the two similar phrases הגנב יומצא אם and הגנב ואם לוא.

L. 9 (Exod 22:6): [omedical SP] > MT. Because the SP reading שנים is extant in line 6 (Exod 22:3), I have reconstructed it as occurring in the two other locations where it occurs in SP (see also line 10).

L. 9 (Exod 22:7): כלוסו MT SP Syr מן Tg. לאו G.

L. 9 (Exod 22:7): והלאוים + קא אלומין G.


113 On the function of אם to introduce subconditions in the Covenant Code, see Levinson and Zahn, "Revelation Regained," 315.

114 For variation between כי and כי, for instance, see lines 4, 6, and 8 of this fragment. The use of both כי and ואם to mark subconditions in biblical law suggests that there was no real semantic or legal distinction between them; see Levinson and Zahn, "Revelation Regained," 316 n. 67.
L. 9 (Exod 22:7): The word ילח appears to be an error for שלח (or perhaps, as Allegro suggests, for a variant reading שלחה). Strugnell suggests that ילח might in fact reflect the G reading at this point, παρεπεμβαίνειν, “act wickedly.” He does not explain the reasoning behind his suggestion, though one wishes that he would have: none of the standard lexica list a Hebrew root שלח or שלחה, and the roots שלח (←לח, “jaw”) and שלחה (←לח, “moist, fresh”) do not have anything to do with wickedness in biblical or post-biblical Hebrew. HAL does mention as a second meaning for the root שלחה the Ugaritic lh, to insult; Old and Egyptian Aramaic לוח, evil. But given that this meaning is not actually attested elsewhere in Hebrew, Strugnell’s suggestion seems tenuous in the extreme, and a simple error seems much more plausible.

L. 10 (Exod 22:8): דע MT SP Tga ενδοκειμένου G לקדם Tg מַסְרָכֶה Syr.

L. 10 (Exod 22:8): יהוה SP יהוה MT G.


L. 10–11 (Exod 22:8–9): I have reconstructed an interval in line 11 before כי, in accordance with the closed paragraph marker (ס) in MT and the קצה in SP between Exod 22:8 and 9. If this interval was not present, line 10 would have been slightly shorter than average.

L. 11 (Exod 22:9): כל SP G Syr כל MT Tg.

L. 12–13 (Exod 22:10–13): In PAM 43.424, frag. 12 (containing lines 12–13) is positioned oddly. Instead of being set diagonally against frag. 11, it should be in a
horizontal position, with its first line on the same horizontal plane as the rest of line

12. (Note the correct placement in the photographic plates in DJD 5.)

**L. 12 (Exod 22:10):** \( \text{בַּמַּלָּהּ} \) MT SP \( \text{καθ’ ο}’ \) \( \text{όλης τῆς παρακαταθήκης G.} \)

**L. 13 (Exod 22:13):** \( \text{זָכַר} \) \( \text{G^{mss(19+108) Syr}} \) \( > \) MT SP G.
2.9.1 Transcription and Translation

1. מְמן מַעַשׂ הַיָּהָוֶה קָדוֹשׁ

2. קָדוֹשׁ דוֹרֵשׁ קָדוֹשׁ

3. לְכָלָה אַשְׁרֵי יָרְקֹתָה בְּכָלָה וּאֵשֶׁר יָשֶׁר מִמְנָה עַל זוֹר וּגְבִרָה מִצְמִיתָה

4. vacat?

5. יִאֶמֶר יְהוָה אֵלֶּה כָּלֶה סְמֵי קַנְתָּה וּשָׁלָחְתָּ נֹטֶף סְמֵי לַכָּה קָח וְלִבְּמוֹשָׁה
2.9.2 Notes on Readings

**L. 1:** ]??? מ֯ן מ֯ לְשׁוֹנַת קֹדֶשׁ. Strugnell construes the traces in this line as ש֯ח֯ מ֯ן קֹדֶשׁ from Exod 30:31. His interpretation of the initial two letters appears correct. Although difficult to see on the photographs, the vertical stroke (the possible נ) does continue below the point where the horizontal stroke comes in to meet it from the right, making a long final letter likely. The horizontal stroke has a slight downward slope, consistent with medial מ.

Following the מ, there are several small traces of ink that certainly would be compatible with Strugnell’s reading משחת. However, after these traces the upper edge of the leather appears to continue at the same level or even bulge upward a bit; it is unclear to me why no more traces are visible further on in the line, even of letters of “normal” height. In particular, if Strugnell’s reading is correct, we would expect to see the tail of the ק in קֹדֶשׁ preserved. The ק’s on this fragment have very short tails compared to the other fragments of 4Q158, but they still extend a good bit below the bottoms of most letters. One could suggest that משחת was the last word on the line and the scribe simply continued the verse on line 2, but then line 2 cannot be reconstructed according to MT, becoming much too long. It thus appears that the text of lines 1–2 did not simply reflect Exod 30:31–32.

**L. 2 (Exod 30:32?):** קֹדֶשׁ. There is just a small trace of the top of the ק remaining.

**L. 3–4 (Exod 30:33):** MT preserves קֹדֶשׁ and SP קֹדֶשׁ after Exod 30:33.
L. 5 (Exod 30:34?): In PAM 43.424, the letter here transcribed as ℏ appears as a curvy vertical stroke without a head. In the DJD 5 plate, however, the letter seems much straighter and seems to have a head, suggesting 𐤀 instead of ℏ. In this case, examination of the original sheds little light. The letter seems to be more curved than the surrounding letters, suggesting that its curvature is due to more than distortion of a straight vertical stroke (consistent with ℏ). On the other hand, there is a hint of a point at the top of the letter, tilting slightly to the right, which could possibly be construed as the head of a very distorted ℏ. There is so much distortion in this part of the fragment that anything is possible, but given the relative straightness of the legs of the preceding ℏ I am slightly more inclined to see ℏ as the better reading. However, the reading כה can be ruled out.

After כה, there are several more letters, but they are badly damaged and slant upward to the left at approximately a 45-degree angle. The first letter looks somewhat like a ב (a square-ish letter open to the left), but what would be the top horizontal stroke appears to extend substantially past the vertical stroke on the righthand side, which would be unique for ב in 4Q158. Careful examination of the electronic photo makes me somewhat more comfortable with calling this letter ב; it in fact appears that there may be two horizontal strokes at the top of the letter, one darker and going beyond the edge of the letter, but one lighter and looking much more as it should. It appears that there may have been a stray stroke of ink over which the scribe wrote a ב. In any case, the second

115 This letter looks completely different on the original; it no longer resembles ב at all, and the traces as preserved are no longer identifiable. Although the manuscript is obviously damaged and distorted
preserved letter is almost definitely a ב. After this ב, the writing angles back down to the left; there is a trace of an upper vertical stroke, then a dark blob of ink, and then several smaller specks. Overall, the traces after ז֯ are consistent with what would come next if indeed this is Exod 30:34, but in no way do they prove that reading.

2.9.3 Comments and Textual Notes

Although Allegro and Strugnell identified this fragment as containing the text of Exod 30:31–34, there are several difficulties with this identification:

1. The lack of further letter traces at the end of line 1 makes the reconstruction of lines 1–2 according to Exod 30:31–32 problematic (see Notes on Readings).

2. If the reading ז֯ in line 5 is not correct, then there is no solid evidence that the material in line 5 represents Exod 30:34.

3. There are two empty lines between the two extant lines (lines 2 and 5).

According to Strugnell’s reconstruction (and that offered here), Exod 30:33 would have been contained in the missing part of line 3, while line 4 would have been completely empty. This is an extremely large interval; there is a closed paragraph marker (ס) in MT and a ה in SP, but this would be a great deal of empty space even if it corresponded to an open paragraph marker (פ). Elsewhere in 4Q158, spacing is used much more sparingly: note that the פ in MT before Exod 21:1 appears as only a space within the line in frag. 7–9.

already in the photo, I have followed it for the reading here because it is clear that more deterioration has occurred since the photo was taken: the ה of ז֯, for instance, which is very clear in the photo, is now completely unrecognizable.
The evidence for accepting the identification with Exod 30:31–34 is as follows:

1. The first preserved traces in line 1 are consistent with the phrase בֵּית הַשָּׁם from Exod 30:31.

2. The string קֹדֶשׁ הוא קֹדֶשׁ occurs only once in the Hebrew Bible, at Exod 30:32.

3. As I indicated above, I think זָהָב is the slightly more probable reading in line 5.

It is probably safest to surmise that this fragment did contain material from Exod 30:31–34, but also contained some unknown material (most likely in lines 1–2).

There are also some indications that frag. 13 may not in fact belong to 4Q158: besides the issue of the unusually large interval mentioned above, the handwriting appears to be a bit different, with more angular ל and much shorter כ than is usual elsewhere in the manuscript. The slightly reddish coloring of this fragment is unique within 4Q158. Also, the space between lines appears to be somewhat larger than normal compared to the other fragments.\(^\text{116}\) Finally, there is a long vertical line on the left edge of frag. 13 that appears to be a marginal ruling; however, it is written in ink and contrasts with the light scoring that is found elsewhere in the manuscript.

In my mind, none of this evidence is conclusive enough to warrant actually arguing that frag. 13 should not be considered part of 4Q158. Ultimately the decision is not of much significance to an understanding of the manuscript, since frag. 13 is so small and difficult to interpret. If we classify it as part of 4Q158, we have evidence that the text

---

\(^\text{116}\) I measure 20 mm from the top of frag. 13 2 to the top of frag. 13 5, for an average of 6.66 mm. As mentioned above, the next-largest average space between lines is frag. 1–2, with 6.03 mm, and the rest of the fragments average less than 5.5 mm.
continued past the Sinai pericope, and we can add one more variant to our collection (see below). There is little else of substance to be drawn from so small a fragment.

**L. 2 (Exod 30:32?):** קדש (2°) MT Tg SP G Syr.

**L. 2 (Exod 30:32?):** קדשים > MT SP G Tg Syr.

**L. 5 (Exod 30:34?):** יאמר [MT] ידבר SP.

**L. 5 (Exod 30:34?):** לאמר + [MT] לאמר SP.

2.10 Fragment 14 (+ 14a)

2.10.1 Transcription and Translation

**Column i**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>frag. 14</th>
<th>frag. 14a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>]h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>]r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>]?r and all the winds/spirits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>]for a blessing for the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td>]for the nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td>]this [ ] and in the land of Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td>]for the nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td>]for the nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td>]for the nations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. [ ]
2. [ ]
3. [ ]
4. [ ]
5. There will be distress and ?[ ... ] I will create bqr?[ ... ]??wl the power of Egypt, and I will redeem them
6. from their hand, and I will make (them) my people until the generation[... ]
   Egypt and the [ ]'
7. of your sons ?[ la]nd in security l[ ] the heart of the sea in the depths
8. of the Deep ?[ ]? who will dwell
9. in it[ ]?[ ... ]wly?

**Column ii** (lineation according to col i)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ש</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>]</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>й</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.10.2 Notes on Readings

**Col i:**

**L. 2:** ר?[. A small dot on the righthand side of ר is all that remains of the previous letter. DSSEL suggests בָּרָשׁ. This reading is possible, but the spot of ink would also be consistent with several other letters.

**L. 3:** ?[. What remains of the unidentifiable letter is a small right angle in what would be the lower right corner, such as on ב, ג, ד, נ, or פ. There appears to have been some flaking on the writing surface, as underlying layers of the leather remain but no further ink is visible.

**L. 4:** הֵגָה[. The tops of the three letters marked with dots are missing.

**L. 4:** הוֹא[. Allegro reads הוֹא[, but there is space visible to the right of the vertical stroke (ה), precluding הו. The tiny speck of ink visible on the edge of the leather is probably the leftmost point of the “serif” on הו.
L. 5: בָּכַר. Only the tops of these letters remain. Although it is unclear in the photographs I have examined, and Strugnell does not identify it, based on the original the third letter is almost certainly a ר or possibly a ב; it has a high serif very similar to that of the first letter and to ר and ב in the previous word. In fact, the first and third letters could each be interpreted as either ב or ר. I have elected to transcribe בָּכַר (perhaps בָּכַר or בָּכַר) largely on the basis of probability: the root בָּכַר does not occur in biblical or rabbinic Hebrew, and בָּכַר (to rot, moulder, decay) is uncommon. A reading בָּכַר might also be possible, involving a root such as בָּכַר or בָּכַר.

L. 5: בָּכַר. Strugnell reads what I have represented as בָּכַר as a “certain” ע. In fact, this reading is not likely: if this were an ע, it would have a long diagonal stroke that is almost horizontal, which would be anomalous for this ms. (compare the ligature of ע and י in the word הַעֲלֹתֵיכֶם in frag. 77, where the diagonal stroke of the ע is far from horizontal). Biblical language provides no support for this reading either; the phrase הַעֲלֹתֵיכֶם does not occur anywhere in the Bible.

Given that Strugnell’s suggestion is unlikely, the proper reading is difficult to determine. The second uncertain letter has a right vertical stroke and a bottom horizontal; the ב that I have transcribed is possible, although the letter would be somewhat shorter and narrower than usual. א would also be possible: the top portion of the letter has disappeared due to flaking of the leather. The meaning of א would be unclear, however. The first letter is obscured not only by the flaking but also by a crack; it appears also to have had a bottom horizontal stroke. My reading בָּכַר should be regarded as
highly tentative: it has the advantage of producing an intelligible reading, but perhaps is suspect for exactly that reason.

Two tiny specks of ink on the far right edge of the leather most likely belong to the final letter of the preceding word.

L. 5: ד. This word is written above the line, with the ד directly over the מ of מצריים.

L. 6: עֶשֶׁרְיָה. Only a tiny speck of the י and a slightly larger trace of the ת are visible on either side of the join between the two pieces of frag. 14a.

L. 6: רֶדוֹ. The upper half of the ר is preserved. Only a tiny speck of ר is visible on the edge of the leather.

L. 6: ה. This portion of the fragment is very difficult to interpret. The photographs show the ה on a small scrap of leather that seems to have been distorted or twisted, as it is rotated clockwise almost 90°. The ה also seems to be smaller than normal—it seems possible that it may have been written above the line. Allegro reads בַּמָּצְרִים, but there are two difficulties with this. First, I can find no trace on any of the photographs of a ב preceding the מ. Second, enough space appears after the ה to make clear that it ended the previous word rather than beginning the word מצריים. DSSEL reads the ה as a מ for מצריים but, besides the issue of spacing, that initial letter would be an extremely oddly-written מ; rather, it is clearly a ה.

Further complicating matters is what appears in the photos to be a large spot of ink and part of a vertical stroke slightly below the previous line, line 5. If indeed this is ink, and not simply damage to the leather or shadows, the spot seems inconsistent with
anything except the top of a ל. However, if there was a ל, its body would have been located almost exactly where the scrap with the ה is now. For that reason, Strugnell’s transcription, ממצרים[5], cannot be correct: his ל is too far to the right.

Examination of the original does not provide as much clarity as would be hoped. The small scrap with the ה is now gone—but that could mean either that it was incorrectly placed there in the first place, or that it has simply been lost. There are no traces of the ל visible on the original, either. This might indicate that what has been interpreted as ink was really just shadows on the photograph. However, this part of the fragment has darkened considerably, such that a ל might no longer be detectable even if it was there originally. Since the ה and the ל seem to occupy the same space, it seems that they could not both originally have been present: either the ה was there and the traces of the ל are just shadows, or the ל was there and the ה does not belong. In either case, the letter would represent the last letter of the word before מצרים.

L. 7: בָּנָה. The נ and י almost look like they are joined at the top, making the two letters resemble an oddly-written מ.

L. 7: ]?. Two tiny specks of the top of a letter remain. Strugnell transcribes א, but the marks are also consistent with ה, ז, and ה.

L. 7: לָבָב[. This word appears smaller than normal and thus may have been written above the line, although its size and elevated position might also be due to distortion of the leather. Allegro and Strugnell transcribe the word normally.

L. 7: הַמַּצְוָות. The bottom of the first ל is clearly visible on PAM 44.191, though not on other photographs or the original. On the other hand, only a speck of ink jutting
into the hole above the line indicates the ל. The speck is no longer visible on the original; it has probably flaked off.

L. 8: תahoma. A trace of ink representing the beginning of the next word is visible on the edge of the leather after תahoma.

L. 8: אש֯ר. Traces of the last letter of the word before אש֯ר are visible. The left vertical stroke of ש and what may be the top right corner are preserved.

L. 9: לו֯ו. Only the very tops (two small specks each) of the two unidentified letters are preserved; they are consistent with Strugnell’s reading ב֯ו֯לות֯, but the second ו is very pointed and could be a י, and for the unidentified letters there are numerous possibilities.

Col ii

6: ש. This reading is very tentative; only a few faded traces of ink remain.

Although Allegro does note a second column for this fragment, he does not note this letter.

8: י. The partially preserved letter may be a י, but also ב or מ. Allegro reads the letter as a certain י.

2.10.3 Comments and Textual Notes

This fragment, as it is presented here, is actually made up of three smaller pieces. Only one of them, containing the lefthand margin of the column, was published by Allegro. The two fragments on the right (which I refer to as frag. 14a) were identified by
Strugnell, who published a transcription in his *Revue de Qumran* article. The three fragments appear together in PAM 42.619 and 44.191, while the left fragment plus one of the others appears in 41.803. The two “additional” fragments are currently preserved in the IAA vault on the same plate as the rest of 4Q158. Since they almost connect physically (the word עָשִׂית in line 6 runs across the break), I refer to them together as frag. 14a. On the other hand, there must have been a fairly large gap between these two fragments and the lefthand fragment (frag. 14), since the right margin of the column is preserved in frag. 14a and the left margin is preserved in frag. 14. Strugnell’s identification seems correct despite the lack of direct physical evidence, however, because of the four fairly well-preserved transitions between lines (from the end of the line, preserved in frag. 14, to the beginning of the next line on frag. 14a), three of them clearly make good sense (lines 4–5, 5–6, 7–8). This would seem an unlikely coincidence if the fragments did not actually belong together.

As has been noted frequently, this fragment is unusual among the fragments of 4Q158 in that it does not reproduce verbatim any significant string of pentateuchal material. For this reason, Tov even suggested initially that frag. 14 should not be considered part of 4Q158. Such a judgment, however, is based on external expectations applied to the text rather than observations arising from the text itself: there is no evidence to suggest that frag. 14 should not be considered part of the same composition as contained in the rest of 4Q158.

---

118 Tov and White, DJD 13:190; Tov, "Biblical Texts as Reworked," 125. Later publications make clear that Tov now does consider frag. 14 to be a part of 4Q158; see e.g. Tov, "Rewritten Bible Compositions," 339.
Despite the lack of “biblical material,” frag. 14 clearly contains references to scriptural themes. In particular, several words and phrases recall the Song of the Sea in Exodus 15: besides the double mention of Egypt, one finds גאל (line 5; Exod 15:13); ליב (line 7; Exod 15:8); the rare word משלות (line 7; Exod 15:5); and החסה (line 8; Exod 15:5, 8). Further, there is language that seems to refer to the covenant promise of land and peoplehood: (?) (line 6), (line 7), לשון (line 7; this term in the Hebrew Bible almost always refers to “dwelling” securely); ישוב (line 8). It seems fairly clear from lines 4–8, therefore, that the material in frag. 14 dealt primarily with God’s deliverance of Israel from Egypt, the concomitant destruction of the Egyptians, and God’s promise to bring Israel safely into the land.

The contents of lines 2–3 are less clear, since only two words are legible on each and the phrases הלברכה והלארי and כל הרוחות are not found in the Hebrew Bible. It seems likely that הלברכה הלארי refers to God’s special provision for the Land of Israel (see e.g. Lev 26:3–13; Deut 7:12–16; 8:7–10), though it is possible that it refers in a more universal sense to the entire world.\(^{119}\) The latter interpretation could find support in the phrase כל הרוחות, which in a broad sense could refer to “all the winds” (i.e. the far corners of the earth), to “all spirits” (i.e. all people), or even to “all the (divine) spirits” (i.e., angels or other semidivine beings).\(^{120}\) On the other hand, רוח plays a prominent role

\(^{119}\) The word הלארי is the only case in 4Q158 where the definite marker -ה is not merged with a prefixed preposition.

\(^{120}\) For the various meanings in a Qumran context, see Arthur Everett Sekki, *The Meaning of Ruah at Qumran* (SBLDS 110; Atlanta: Scholars, 1989). This particular phrase, כל הרוחות, occurs only once in the Hebrew Bible, in Jer 49:36: “I shall bring against Elam four winds from (the) four corners of the earth, and I shall scatter them to all these winds (לכל הרוחות האלפים) …”. The Qumran corpus also provides little
in God’s deliverance of Israel from Egypt (Exod 14:21; 15:8, 10). Even though רוח always appears in the singular in those texts, one could imagine that an ancient editor envisioned "all the winds," being enlisted to help the Israelites pass safely through the sea. In that sense, both הָרוּחַ הָאוֹסָר הָעָם and "all the winds" could fit well within the context of Exodus and covenant promise described above. Furthermore, even if the immediate context of these phrases were to have dealt with all of creation or had a more universal perspective, the join of these motifs with those of the Exodus is not unknown; Second Isaiah famously depicts the Exodus in cosmic language (Isa 50:2–3; 51:9–11).

The contents, therefore, are far from unrelated to the text of Exodus, and in fact provide clues as to where the original setting of frag. 14 + 14a would have been. Segal suggests that the text represents a paraphrase of Exod 6:3–8, filled out with details from Exodus 15. Prima facie evidence that supports this suggestion is the use of imperfect and converted perfect verbs in both passages: each depicts God’s liberating actions as occurring in the future. (Exod 6:6–8 ולָקָחְתָּי, וָגוֹאָלָתָי, וַהֲצָלָתָי, וַהֲוָאָתָי, etc.; frag. 14 + 14a וָגוֹאָלָתָי, וַעֲשֶׂיתָי, וַיִּשְׁבוּ, וַיִּשְׁיִבוּ). I therefore agree with Segal that Exodus 6 is the most evidence: aside from the instance here in 4Q158, כל הָרוּחַ occurs only once, in 8Q5. The context is not preserved, but the phrase in question reads [ךָּל הָרוּחַ לְפָנֵיכֶּךָ]. Given that the רוח are here doing something (standing [ךָּל הָרוּחַ לְפָנֵיכֶּךָ] or [ךָּל הָרוּחַ לְפָנֵיךָ] before or in the presence of God, the phrase might refer to heavenly beings at this point. This is the interpretation of Sekki, Meaning of Ruah, 165-66. It does not seem justified, however, to assume on the basis of 8Q5, as Sekki does, that כל הָרוּחַ refers to heavenly beings in 4Q158 as well. First, the interpretation of the phrase in 8Q5 is far from certain. Second, given the nature of 4Q158, we might expect its author to be influenced more by biblical phraseology than by post-biblical Hebrew; in the Hebrew Bible, with only one exception (Prov 16:2), רוח means “winds.”


The verb tenses are one reason why Segal’s suggestion strikes me as more plausible than that of Strugnell, who proposed that frag. 14 was originally located proximate to frag. 4 because the latter seems to end with God recounting at least some episodes in Israel’s “sacred history”; see Strugnell, "Notes en Marge," 175. Strugnell does not address the discrepancy between the perfect verb of frag. 4 6 and the
likely setting for the material found in frag. 14 + 14a. I would, however, amend his
proposal in two ways. First, while Segal bases himself upon two cases of shared
vocabulary (Exod 6:6; Exod 6:7), a more persuasive case can be made in light of parallels in theme,
rather than vocabulary. Second, Segal’s characterization of the passage as a paraphrase of
Exod 6:3–8, supplemented with details from Exodus 15, underemphasizes what I believe
is an important point. The paraphrase is not somehow separate from the addition of
material from Exodus 15. Rather, the blending of the two passages itself constitutes the
paraphrase. We have a sort of “paraphrase by conflation” of the themes and vocabulary
of the two passages.

The language of Exodus 15, with its archaic poetic style, differs considerably
from the prose of Exod 6:3–8. Exodus 15 refers specifically to the destruction of the
Egyptian army at the Sea, while Exodus 6 describes God’s liberation of the Israelites in
quite general terms. On the other hand, Exodus 6 speaks quite explicitly of the Israelites’
destination as the Land of Canaan, the land promised as an inheritance to Israel’s
ancestors, while Exodus 15 refers metaphorically to the land as God’s “holy habitation”
(15:13) and “the mountain of your inheritance” (15:17). Appreciation of these and other
differences, however, should not obscure the fundamental overlap in content of these two
passages: both address God’s deliverance of Israel from Egypt and Israel’s resettlement

imperfects and converted perfects used in frag. 14, nor the problem of a “recollection” or repetition of past
events using verb forms that appear to refer to future events. Furthermore, if the analysis of frag. 4
presented above is correct, the historical “recollection” in lines 6–7 is designed specifically to associate the
covenant with the patriarchs with the Sinai covenant, not to rehearse Israel’s Heilsgeschichte. Segal does
not respond explicitly to Strugnell’s suggestion, which is surprising given that Segal also sees reference to
Exodus 6 in frag. 4.
in the land. They overlap in more minor details as well: both refer to God’s power (ברוחה in 6:6; נון in 15:6; זרוע in 15:16), both use the word נא to refer to Israel’s redemption (6:6; 15:13), both refer to Israel as God’s people (6:7; 15:16), both refer to God “bringing” (הביא) Israel to the land (6:8; 15:17).

Given these parallels, it is not surprising that these two passages would be read in light of one another. 4Q158 frag. 14 + 14a seems to textualize this reading-together, reflecting in its language aspects of both texts. More reminiscent of Exodus 6 is the mention of “blessing for the land” (frag. 14 3; compare mention of the land in Exod 6:4, 8); the explicit mention of “the land of Egypt” and “the power of Egypt” (frag. 14 4–5; cf. Exod 6:5–6); and the statement “I will make (them) into my people” (frag. 14a 6; cf. Exod 6:7, לעם לי אתכם ולקחתי). Recalling Exodus 15 and its more detailed description of the victory at the sea are the words mentioned above: רוחות, ים, מצולות, והים, as well as the mention of “the nations” (הגויים, frag. 14a 4; cf. Exod 15:14–15). If Segal is correct to view Exodus 6, before the exodus, as the setting of this material, it seems that an editor has rephrased the promise of liberation in Exodus 6 so that it contains more of the specific details of the account in Exodus 15. Once again, prediction and execution are brought into closer alignment with one another. It should be noted, though, that such an alignment does not exclude completely new elements—in this case perhaps a more cosmic dimension, as might be implied in the words אברא and כל הרוחות.

L. 6–7: Strugnell proposes the following reconstruction: גויים, לבם, and הבת. This may be as plausible as anything. There is space for two short words between הבת and הנכה, and the latter word is used very frequently in the context of
dwell in the land. I am not convinced that, if the reading יעשתי in the line above is correct, there would in fact have been room for [אש י] in the lacuna. However, the placement of the two pieces of frag. 14a in PAM 44.191 appears to be a little off; there should be slightly more space between them to allow for the rest of the י and ת of יעשתי.

So there may have been sufficient space for Strugnell’s proposed reconstruction; in any case, it is difficult to imagine anything else that would make as much sense.

If בנכה does mean “your children” in this instance, the second-person singular suffix represents a departure from the reference to the Israelites in the third-person plural elsewhere in this fragment. (It seems unlikely that the 2ms suffix would somehow refer to Moses or any other individual.)

2.11 Fragment 15

2.11.1 Transcription

[תועדה] 1
[? ו ?] 2
[? ל] 3

2.11.2 Notes on Readings

L. 1: [תועדה]. This line is no longer visible at all on the original. What remains of the first letter in the photographs is a downstroke, bowed to the right, and a short horizontal foot towards the left of the downstroke. The only possible letters would seem to be י and ת; ת seems more likely for two reasons. First, the left leg of ת does sometimes
bow to the right in this ms (though usually not quite this much), while ้ is generally bowed to the left or straight. Second, the horizontal stroke is very short for ้, and seems more consistent with ں.

The form of the ں is uncharacteristic for 4Q158: it is much more “upright” than is usual in this ms.

Allegro marks the third letter (my ّ) as unidentifiable. Although a crack runs through the letter, it seems clear that it consisted of a right vertical stroke and an upper horizontal stroke: either ے or ں.

L. 2: ّ?\. The ے could probably also be a ں; the top right corner does have a very slight tick or pointed corner, which would be uncharacteristic for ں in this manuscript, but not impossible (see for example the angular ں of держива in frag. 7–9 6 and חרבנה in frag. 7–9 8).

L. 3: ّ\. Traces of what appears to be a vertical stroke of ink are visible below the ں of line 2. If indeed this is a letter, its height means it must be a ں. The leftmost edge of the stroke is not visible; thus, there is no trace remaining of the ں’s “flag.”

2.11.3 Comments

Little can be said about this fragment due to its small size. The correct interpretation of the one legible word is unclear. If the interpretation of the first extant letter of line 1 as ں is correct, it would seem that the word must be an Ht-conjugation third person feminine singular verb (המעידה or התעדה). Neither the root עדר nor the root
occurs in verbal form in the Hebrew Bible or in the nonbiblical scrolls from Qumran. HAL lists a conjectural attestation of ūd II, “rejoice” (compare Ug. ḡdd), based on a suggested emendation of āṭěʿérēṯ in Job 31:29 to āṭěʿērēṯ. Obviously such evidence does not carry much weight. Nor does later Hebrew usage provide much help. Dictionaries of tannaitic and amoraic literature list the root ūd occurring once, as a G passive participle, in the meaning “cut, strip.” Similarly, ṣ ēḏ occurs once as a G active participle in Genesis Rabbah, apparently in the meaning “stir up, drive,” in an etymology of the name of Enoch’s son ēḏ (Gen 4:18). The rarity of these verbs even in rabbinic Hebrew and their lack of earlier attestation does not inspire much confidence as to their relevance here.

Perhaps more promising is the root ūd, which occurs in the Hebrew Bible both in the po’lēl (Ps 146:9; 147:6) and the hitpo’lēl (Ps 20:9). The hitpo’lēl is also attested three times in the nonbiblical Qumran scrolls, twice in 1QH 12:12, where it has the meaning “raise oneself up; stand straight.” The problem with this solution is that all the instances of this verb in the Hebrew Bible and at Qumran are spelled with ū (thus, āṭěʿērēṯ in 1QH 12:36). It would be very unusual for such a word to be spelled defectively, and would not follow the orthographic norms of the rest of 4Q158.

In the end, we are left with a choice between an otherwise unattested form of a rare root or an anomalous spelling of a more common root. Given the complete lack of

124 At b. Qam. 11a.
125 The third occurrence is in 4Q382 23 1, where the context is extremely fragmentary.
further context, the correct interpretation of this word must remain an open question. We can say with certainty, however, that this word does not represent anything attested in other versions of the Pentateuch; thus, frag. 15 must have contained additional material.

2.12 Conclusion

The detailed textual analysis in the foregoing chapter, besides establishing the text of 4Q158, has provided a conceptual framework for the remainder of this study. The commentary has demonstrated the richness and intricacy of 4Q158’s engagement with the text of Genesis and Exodus, from cases where the text largely agrees with known versions to those where 4Q158 contains major deviations. In the next chapter, attention will be turned specifically to the methods and goals of this scriptural rewriting.
CHAPTER 3:
COMPOSITIONAL TECHNIQUES IN 4Q158

The comments on each fragment in the preceding chapter focused, for the most part, on the reconstruction of the text and on the nature and purpose of the departures in 4Q158 from known versions of the Pentateuch. For the rest of this study, I will focus more narrowly on charting the specific ways in which the pentateuchal text was transformed in 4Q158 and related texts. In the first part of this chapter, I will limit myself to describing the type, size, and frequency of changes extant in 4Q158, and considering the possible motivations for these changes. In the second part, I will consider the question of who was responsible for the changes; that is, whether we can understand all or most of the changes in 4Q158 as resulting from a single “redaction.”

3.1 Compositional Techniques

In what follows, I will treat only cases of readings that are unique to 4Q158. “Variant” readings that agree with one or more of the major ancient versions (G, SP, MT) are much more likely to have existed in the Vorlage of the composition reflected in 4Q158 than to have originated with it.\textsuperscript{126} Some of the unique readings, especially minor variations, may well have been present in the Vorlage as well but, given that they are not

\textsuperscript{126} See section 1.3.3 above.
attested elsewhere, deserve consideration as to whether they might have originated simultaneously with some of the larger changes that are characteristic of 4Q158. (More on this in section 3.2.)

3.1.1 Addition of New Material

There are twelve clear instances of addition of new material in 4Q158. Of these, eight consist of only a single word: frag. 1–2 3 (שבה); frag. 1–2 4 (יחד;); frag. 1–2 5 (לו); frag. 1–2 13 (כפות שתי;); frag. 1–2 14 (לאמר;); frag. 4 3 (למאמר;); frag. 7 4 (את;); frag. 13 2 (קדשים). As this list shows, sometimes the pluses are of very little significance to the meaning of the text (e.g. לו in frag. 1–2 5). At other times, however, they do seem to serve a substantial purpose. The change from הירך כף to הירך כפות שתי in frag. 1–2 13, for instance, has halakhic implications. The insertion of ויאחזהו "and he seized hold of him," in frag. 1–2 4, on the other hand, seems intended to clarify why the “man” asks to be let go (שלחני) in Gen 32:27.

The four cases of larger additions in 4Q158 vary in size and purpose. The four-word plus in frag. 7 3 (אמרו ליוה אל משה) seems to have been prompted by the rearrangement of elements in the Sinai pericope: it effects a transition between the end of the Decalogue and the command to Moses that follows. A similar purpose can be detected behind the addition in frag. 6 6, which smooths the

127 See Bernstein, "What Has Happened to the Laws?," 46.

128 See above, section 2.7.3.
transition between material from Deuteronomy 5 and Deuteronomy 18. On the other hand, the added blessing in frag. 1–2 7–10 seems to address a difficulty or “gap” that an editor perceived in the scriptural text: the mention that Jacob received a blessing, but the absence of the content of that blessing. The final case, in frag. 1–2 17–19 (beginning לָלָכָה נַעְרוֹ), is difficult to interpret because it is so poorly preserved. The possible presence of the verb נָשָׁל, “draw off,” also attested at Exod 3:5, may even imply that this is not an addition of purely new material, but an addition that paraphrases another pentateuchal text. Without more of the content, though, it is impossible to be sure.

3.1.2 Addition of Material Attested Elsewhere in the Pentateuch

This type of addition involves the repetition of material located elsewhere in the Pentateuch. The six clear cases of such addition in 4Q158 evince a variety of techniques and purposes. In two cases, redeployment with minor changes is used to create a correspondence between a command and its fulfillment. In frag. 7–9 5, God’s command to Moses in Deut 5:30–31 (עַמְּדֵי עַמְּדֵהוּ פָה וַאֲתָה לַאֲלָלֶיךָ לֵאמָר לָעַלָּם לֵאמָר מַעְמַדְדוֹ...), is transformed to a report of the command’s fulfillment through little else than a change in verb tense and explicit identification of the subjects: וַיָּשָׁבוּ עַמְּדֵי אֲלָלֶיךָ עִמּוּדֵו מַעְמַדְדוֹ לְפִנֵי יְהוָה... In frag. 1–2 12, on the other hand, the “fulfillment” notice serves as the model for a command: what is portrayed as a folk custom in Gen 32:33, avoidance of eating the sciatic nerve (אַל לֹא יִאֶכֶל בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אַתֶּם אֲדֹנָיו בְּכָל אֲגָז כְּפָה וְיַדָּם...), seems to be transformed into obedience to a divine command. The command is created simply by inserting the same sentence immediately prior to the כְּפָה וְיַדָּם clause but changing the imperfect verb into a negative imperative (אָל לֹא)...
In two other cases, the repeated material is not changed but simply recalled; in both of these instances, the text at issue is God’s announcement to Moses in Exod 3:12b, “When you lead the people out from Egypt, you shall worship God upon this mountain.” In frag. 1–2 16, presumably in response to the notice in Exod 4:28 that “Moses told Aaron all the words of YHWH,” 4Q158 adds the transcript, as it were, of Moses’ report to Aaron: ... Note that here the repeated material is prefaced by an introduction of completely new material that serves to locate the repeated material in the new context (here, Moses’ report to Aaron). A similar introduction, of unknown size, seems to have preceded the second repetition of Exod 3:12b, in frag. 4 2. In this case, only the words are preserved at the beginning of line 2.

We cannot know precisely how the Exod 3:12 material was introduced in this context, but the remaining text on either side of line 2 provides some clues. First, frag. 4 3–5 describes the covenant ratification ceremony on Sinai (Exodus 24). Second, the two words preserved in frag. 4 1 are לכה צוה, “he commanded you.” Given the cultic acts that follow and the mention of a command, it is probable that Exod 3:12b is cited precisely to indicate that the proceedings on Sinai take place in conformity with God’s earlier speech to Moses, here apparently interpreted as a divine command.\(^{129}\) Thus the missing part of line 1, prior to the beginning of Exod 3:12b, may have contained new material that recalled the original setting of God’s speech.\(^{130}\)

\(^{129}\) See above, section 2.4.4.

\(^{130}\) The speaker and addressee of the words לכה צוה in line 1 are unclear because of the fragmentary context. The best options would seem to be 1) Moses speaking to the people (as a collective), with the sense of “YHWH commanded you to worship him on this mountain, as he said to me: ‘when you
The two final cases in 4Q158 of addition of material from elsewhere also merit discussion. First, the situation found in frag. 4 6–7 is unique in that the additional material appears to be drawn from two other passages, Exod 6:3–7 and Gen 17:7–8. Instead of simply “copying and pasting” material from one context into another, an editor here seems first to have combined material from his two sources and then inserted it into the new context (here, Exodus 24).\textsuperscript{131}

Finally, I would locate in this category the juxtaposition of the story of Jacob’s wrestling match (Genesis 32) with material from the end of Exodus 4. As I suggest in the comments to frag. 1–2 in ch. 2, it seems most likely that the main narrative context of this fragment is Exodus 4, and that the Genesis 32 material represents a sort of “flashback” prompted by the similar episode of God’s attempt on Moses’ life in Exod 4:24–26. To speak of true rearrangement to characterize this type of “flashback” seems inappropriate, since from a narrative perspective this episode from the life of Jacob, who lived some 400 years before Moses, cannot have occurred during Moses’ lifetime. It therefore seems reasonable to conclude that, in the mind of whoever juxtaposed these two stories, the Jacob story retained its place among the patriarchal narratives. This does not necessarily mean that this story physically appeared twice in 4Q158, once in its original location in Genesis and once here in the context of Exodus 4, since there is no clear evidence that 4Q158 actually covered the book of Genesis. I would suggest, though, that if 4Q158 did

\textsuperscript{131} For a detailed discussion, see above, section 2.4.4.
originally cover Genesis as well as Exodus, this Jacob pericope would indeed have occurred twice.

3.1.3 Omissions

There are no clear, extant cases of omission in 4Q158; not even minor cases involving single words. Twice in the notes to the edition above I have suggested haplography in instances where reconstruction according to MT/SP yields a line that is too long (frag. 5 3; frag. 10–12 8). Even if these suggestions are correct, there would be no cases of deliberate omission in 4Q158.\footnote{This assessment does not address the issue of the original scope of the composition contained in 4Q158 and whether that scope corresponded to the scope of the Pentateuch or any one of its books. (That is, whether 4Q158 in its original form “omitted” or failed to include large swaths of material.) First, this issue is fundamentally irresolvable given the present state of the manuscript. Second, the issue only becomes one of “omission” (as opposed to, say, “inclusion”) if the presumption is made that the composition in 4Q158 would have or should have covered all of the Pentateuch or one of its books. For scope as a criterion for distinguishing “rewritten Scripture” compositions from editions of biblical books, see Segal, “Between Bible and Rewritten Bible,” 20.}

3.1.4 Changes: Minor Alterations, Paraphrase, and Rearrangement

Besides additions (whether of new material or material from elsewhere), other types of alterations also occur in 4Q158, although with somewhat less frequency. There are four instances of minor alterations, where one word or word form is replaced with another.\footnote{Frag. 6 8 (אָנָשָׁה for אָנָשָׁהִי); frag. 10–12 4 (וָאֵל for וַאֲלִי); frag. 10–12 6 (בִּיֵּעָה for בִּיֵּעֲה; בְּשַׁעַר for בְּשַׁעֲר); frag. 10–12 7 (תַּחַת for תַּחֲת).} With one exception, all of these are insignificant to the interpretation of the text, and in some cases we cannot even be sure that 4Q158 represents a later form of the
text than other versions. The exception is the appearance of יבעה instead of MT, SP in frag. 10–12 6 (Exod 22:4).

I employ the term “paraphrase” to indicate instances where the substance or basic content of a passage has been retained, but is expressed in different words. A fairly clear example of this technique in 4Q158 occurs in frag. 4 4: instead of MT, SP (Exod 24:5aβ), 4Q158 reads [על המזבח] [ה عليه] [ויעלו]. Since the line breaks off at this point, we do not know whether the paraphrase continued to cover the material in the rest of Exod 24:5. However, we see that here 4Q158 reflects essentially the same activity in slightly different words (including an apparent change of subject from נני בני ישראל to Moses).

Another possible instance of paraphrase occurs in frag. 3. Here, the few extant words seem to be consistent with the ideas expressed by Jacob in Gen 47:29–30, but there is not enough overlap in vocabulary to support the conclusion that this passage was simply included verbatim in frag. 3. Segal therefore characterizes this fragment as a

---

134 In cases where the difference is minimal, such as אשר או for in frag. 6 8 or אם for in frag. 10–12 7, it is probably impossible to decide which form of the text is earlier.

135 On this change, see the edition notes above.

136 Tov characterizes as paraphrastic works that “not only add and omit details but also change the wording of the biblical text”; see Tov, “Biblical Texts as Reworked,” 116.

137 The new formulation here resembles somewhat that of Exod 40:29, ואה אל המזבח את תם את אהל ויעל את על המזבח... "And the altar of burnt offering he placed at the entrance of the tabernacle, the tent of meeting, and he sacrificed upon it the burnt offering and the grain offering..." It may be that the author of 4Q158 for some reason wished to adapt the language of Exod 24:5 to that of Exod 40:29—perhaps because in both instances Moses supervises cultic procedures? However, the extant parallels are not all that extensive and consist of common cultic terms; therefore it is difficult to determine if an allusion to Exod 40:29 really was intended. If it was, then this paraphrase may have been intended to stress the similarity between the two sacrificial acts.
paraphrase, although he fails to note an important detail: if we assume that the line-lengths in this fragment were generally consistent with other fragments of 4Q158, there must have been a substantial amount of additional material incorporated into this paraphrase, since Jacob’s instructions in Gen 47:29–30 would cover only about 1.5 lines at ca. 100 letter-spaces per line. Thus paraphrase here was probably combined with expansion.

A third instance of paraphrase is represented by frag. 14 + 14a. Although this fragment was long characterized as containing no biblical material, its language is in fact quite biblical and points to a specific context: a prediction of God’s victory at the Sea. While there is no citation of multiple words from a specific verse, the vocabulary demonstrates that the contents of frag. 14 + 14a can be understood as a paraphrase of Exod 6:3–8, whereby material from that pericope (which contains God’s promise that he will free the Israelites from Egypt) is combined with material from Exodus 15 (which celebrates the specific circumstances in which God fulfills his promise).

Finally, in 4Q158 there is one likely case of what I think qualifies as true rearrangement; that is, the dislocation of material from its original context to its new context such that it no longer appears in the original context. This case is frag. 7–9, which presents the end of the Decalogue after the people’s request to Moses for mediation. As I argue at length in the comments to this fragment, it is highly likely, as Segal suggested, that the final eight commandments were removed from their original position so that only

\[138\] He characterizes the issue in the following terms: “From the few words preserved in fragment 3 it appears to contain a text similar to those found in the stories of Jacob in the Pentateuch, yet no group of verses corresponds exactly to the preserved material. It therefore seems more likely that these lines represent a ‘rewriting’ of a biblical passage containing a story of Jacob”; Segal, "Biblical Exegesis," 53.
the first two commandments (voiced in the first person) are given before the request for mediation.139

3.2 Understanding the Development of 4Q158

Up to this point, I have deliberately used ambiguous language with reference to the person or persons responsible for the unique version of the text of Exodus that we find reflected in 4Q158. The time has come, however, to reflect on whether the changes preserved in 4Q158 can be viewed as largely the work of a single editor, or whether it is better to entertain the possibility that the changes, even the major ones, were introduced gradually by a series of copyist-editors. This is an issue that will recur in the following chapters for 4Q364–367, SP and its forebears, and TS.

The tendency in recent discussions of the 4QRP manuscripts, SP and the pre-Samaritan texts from Qumran, and the phenomenon of “multiple literary editions” of biblical books is to attribute all the major changes evident in a particular book to a thoroughgoing redaction by a single individual.140 Thus, in his article on 4Q158, Segal repeatedly refers to the “author” of 4Q158, just as Tov refers to the “author” of 4QRP in two recent publications.141 On the other hand, there has also been a recognition, often by

138

139 For details, see section 2.7.3 above.

140 The idea of “multiple literary editions” of biblical books was developed by Eugene Ulrich; see e.g. Eugene Ulrich, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 99-120.

141 See Segal, "Biblical Exegesis," at e.g. 47, 48, 51; Tov, "Biblical Texts as Reworked," 127; Tov, "Rewritten Bible Compositions," 337. (Tov speaks consistently in this latter article of “the editor” of the pre-Samaritan texts.) See also Ulrich, Dead Sea Scrolls, 65. Here Ulrich refers to “one or possibly more scribes” responsible for the pre-Samaritan version of Exodus, though later on the same page this becomes “a scribe.”
the same scholars, that the process of transmission of scriptural texts in the Second Temple period was characterized by revision and expansion; that is, copyists were not passive conduits of a fixed text, recognizable only when they made a mistake, but active partners in shaping the text long after that text had ostensibly received its “final” form.\textsuperscript{142} If the license to make changes was part and parcel of the scribal task in the Second Temple period, what basis do we have for ascribing all the major changes in a particular text to a single redactor-author?

In discussions of expanded versions of biblical books and of “Rewritten Scripture,” a single redactor-author is more often presumed than argued for. An exception is the discussion of the longer MT edition of the book of Jeremiah, where there has been some debate as to whether the expansions present in the MT came about gradually (McKane speaks of a “rolling corpus”) or as the result of a thoroughgoing redaction.\textsuperscript{143} In the context of this discussion, Beat Huwyler articulates the criterion that, in order to posit an overall redaction, changes must be repeated and serve a discernible purpose; that is, there must be a unifying goal or ideology that ties the changes together.\textsuperscript{144} For Jeremiah,


Hwyler and others cite aspects of the MT version such as an increased concern with Babylon and Nebuchadrezzar and with the Temple vessels as evidence that the text did undergo an overarching redaction at some point, alongside continual development in minor details. To take an example from the realm of “rewritten Scripture,” one could cite the persistent concern in the book of Jubilees with the calendar, as well as the frequent mention of the Heavenly Tablets, as evidence for a unified redactional perspective operative in that work. Hwyler’s basic observation thus provides some way in to answering the question of whether the changes in 4Q158 should be attributed to a single redactor.

Examination of the major changes in 4Q158 indicates that they appear to serve several different functions. The basis for the juxtaposition of Genesis 32 and Exodus 4 in frag. 1–2, for instance, seems to be an association of elements with a common theme. On the other hand, the addition of a 3-line blessing in frag. 1–2 seems to be a response to a perceived “gap” in the text. Similar gap-filling, in the form of speech reports or notices of fulfilled commands, is evident in frag. 1–2 16 (Moses’ report to Aaron); frag. 4 2 (the Israelites’ worship on Sinai); and frag. 7–9 5 (the people’s return to their tents). If the above analysis of the contents of frag. 14 + 14a is correct, then that fragment seems to represent an attempt to make a prediction or promise (Exod 6:3–8) correspond more closely to the hymnic celebration of its fulfillment (Exod 15:1–19). In two instances, small additions seem intended to create smoother transitions within the text (“…say to them,” frag. 6 6; “and YHWH said to Moses,” frag. 7–9 3). Finally, there are some changes that respond to other sorts of perceived problems with the text: In frag. 1–2 12, a folk custom is transformed (it seems) into a divine command (יְנַחַם ה’). The
rearrangement of the Decalogue evident in frag. 7–9 seems to respond to the interpretive difficulties regarding the people’s request for mediation and the switch in voicing from first person to third person within the Decalogue itself. Last but not least, the additional material in frag. 4 6–8 seems intended to address the hermeneutical question of the relationship between God’s covenant with the patriarchs and the covenant at Sinai.

An obvious concern is evident in all of these changes for the coherence, unity, and self-referentiality of Scripture. Problems are solved, gaps filled in, clarifying exegeses embedded in the text. In that way, the changes in 4Q158 do point to a consistent perspective or at least a consistent attitude towards the pentateuchal text. Even some of the very minor additions—the types of changes that are so ubiquitous in the transmission of scriptural texts as to make determining their origins almost impossible—seem to reflect a desire to improve the readability of the text. The addition in frag. 1–2 4 of יְהֹוָה serves this purpose fairly clearly, and other additions could certainly be understood in this way (e.g. שִׁמְחָה in frag. 1–2 3; לְמַסֶּר in frag. 4 3). 145 Does this then constitute the unified redactional perspective we have been looking for?

I believe that, because of the general unity of perspective, the significant changes in 4Q158 could certainly have been introduced by a single redactor/scribe. However, it is difficult to make a convincing argument that this was actually the case. The reason for this is that the attitude towards the pentateuchal text exhibited in 4Q158 seems to have

---

145 Tov notes that, while the source of such minor changes would usually not be traceable, if the versions of a particular passage contain evidence of an “overall recensional layer,” then minor differences in the same passage may also be attributable to this same recensional layer. See Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 347. Tov does not indicate how one might decide whether the minor and major changes really do belong together; I would suggest that, if minor changes appear to be consistent with tendencies or goals evident in the larger changes, it is at least possible that they originated at the same time.
been relatively common in the Second Temple circles responsible for the transmission and interpretation of Scripture. As the following chapters will show, the same basic attitude, as well as many of the same compositional techniques used to express it, is found in the other 4QRP mss, in the pre-Samaritan versions of Exodus and Numbers, in SP, and in the Temple Scroll.

The point of this discussion is not to argue for or against a single redactor as responsible for the unique configuration of texts found in 4Q158. My intention is only to indicate that we must keep in mind the possibility that the text grew in stages. In fact, we already have clear evidence for at least five stages of composition: the Old Greek, represented by LXX; the version of Exodus preserved in the MT, with its apparently more developed version of the Tabernacle pericope in chapters 35–39; \(^{146}\) the expanded version preserved in SP and 4QpaleoExod\(^{146}\); and the further expanded versions preserved in 4Q158, on the one hand, and in the final, sectarian version of SP on the other. We should not exclude from our conceptual frameworks the possibility of further stages just because we do not have manuscript evidence for them. The issue is not that these stages are recoverable (if they did in fact occur)—they are not. But too often in the short history of scholarship on the Qumran Scrolls, models have gained ascendancy for no real reason other than our assumption that they were correct. The unique form of 4Q158 may well be the work of a single redactor, but it may also be the work of a series of scribes/redactors,

\(^{146}\) The situation of the Tabernacle pericope is complicated, but it does seem safe to say that MT represents a more developed version of Exodus 35–39 than does LXX (which, as Aejmelaeus has demonstrated, is more than likely based upon a Hebrew Vorlage). See Anneli Aejmelaeus, "Septuagintal Translation Techniques--A Solution to the Problem of the Tabernacle Account," in Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings (eds. George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars; SBLSCS 33; Atlanta: Scholars, 1992), 381–402; Ulrich, Dead Sea Scrolls, 102.
each of whom endeavored in passing on the text to make explicit more of the perfection that was believed to reside in it.
In their DJD edition of 4Q364–367, Tov and Crawford characterize the relationship between the five 4QRP manuscripts as follows:

The five manuscripts of 4QRP share important characteristics. These five groups of fragments should therefore be seen as copies of the same composition, rather than, in more general terms, of the same literary genre. This composition contained a running text of the Pentateuch interspersed with exegetical additions and omissions. The greater part of the preserved fragments follows the biblical text closely, but many small exegetical elements are added, while other elements are omitted, or, in other cases, their sequence altered. The exegetical character of this composition is especially evident from several exegetical additions comprising half a line, one line, two lines, and even seven or eight lines.  

According to this assessment, then, all five 4QRP mss are considered copies of a single composition because they all show the same types of “exegetical” changes vis-à-vis the known text of the Pentateuch. Several objections could be (and have been) raised against particular aspects of this assessment. Why, for instance, would similarity in “exegetical character” (by which I understand Tov and Crawford to mean what I call compositional technique—the way the pentateuchal text is reworked) necessarily indicate

---

147 Tov and White, DJD 13:191.
that all five manuscripts represent a single composition?\footnote{For the difficulties involved in using the term “exegetical” in contexts such as this one, see section 1.3.1 above.} One might also ask, of course, whether there is really a “composition” other than the Pentateuch itself present in these manuscripts. In this chapter, however, I am going to leave these metatextual questions aside to focus on the assertion that lies at the heart of Tov and Crawford’s characterization: that the five manuscripts labeled 4QRP each approach the text of the Pentateuch in the same way.

This assertion has not gone unchallenged in the brief history of scholarship on the 4QRP mss. Michael Segal and Moshe Bernstein have each argued that 4Q158 reflects an approach to the Pentateuch that is \textit{qualitatively} different from that found in 4Q364–367.\footnote{Segal, "4QReworked Pentateuch," 396; Bernstein, "Pentateuchal Interpretation at Qumran," 134.} Segal further suggests that a distinction should be made between 4Q364 and 4Q365, on the one hand, and 4Q366 and 4Q367 on the other.\footnote{Segal, "4QReworked Pentateuch," 397-98.} However, aside from a few general remarks, evidence for these positions has not been provided. The purpose of this chapter is to remedy this situation by presenting the results of a detailed investigation of the compositional techniques evidenced in each of the four manuscripts, 4Q364–367.\footnote{All transcriptions from 4Q364–367 that appear below, unless otherwise noted, follow Tov and White in DJD 13.} This investigation provides firmer footing for conclusions regarding the relationships between the five 4QRP mss.

In what follows, I comment on all of the substantial differences vis-à-vis the MT and other known versions in 4Q364–367, and on most of the more minor differences.
Space does not allow full consideration of every example of insignificant changes like small additions and minor alterations, especially examples that contribute little to our understanding of compositional and exegetical technique in the 4QRP mss. Similarly, I do not discuss cases where the evidence shows that the ms differed in some way from known versions, but little more can be said about the nature of the difference. A list of all unique differences between 4Q364–367 and known versions is available in the Appendix.

4.1 4Q364

4Q364 is one of the larger 4QRP mss, with 32 numbered fragments of varying sizes that cover material from Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. Despite the broad scope, the actual extant text is often extremely fragmentary: the fragments average only 2.9 fully or partially extant words per inscribed line.\textsuperscript{152} This means it is often difficult to know precisely how the pentateuchal text was reworked at a given point. Nonetheless, enough remains to allow an analysis according to the categories used to describe the compositional techniques of 4Q158.

4.1.1 Addition of New Material

4Q364 contains additions of various sizes, just as we saw to be the case in 4Q158. The smallest additions, as noted above, are the most difficult to evaluate. Of the five minor pluses in 4Q364, two are trivial and have no discernable purpose—they may not

\textsuperscript{152} This calculation is meant only as a rough indication of the manuscript’s state of preservation. In my calculations, I included only lines where at least one identifiable letter is preserved.
even be additions at all. Three cases, however, show clearer signs of purpose, meaning they can more confidently be classified as secondary. They serve a variety of purposes, from improving readability and syntax to minor harmonizations and exegetical notes. In the first case, the addition of את simply brings the verse into conformity with normal classical Hebrew grammar, in which an את before a definite direct object is expected:

Gen 30:31

את תעשה יי הדבר והוה

4Q364 4b,e ii 10

את תעשה [לא את התבר והוה]

Another language-based insertion occurs in frag. 15:

Gen 25:20

יורו ישחק בן ארבעים杉יהבדברוה והוה רבקה בת ארצה ויהי ארם

4Q364 1 3–5

[Now Isaac was forty years old when he took Редакка—daughter of Betu’el the Aramean, from Padan Aram, the sister of Laban—as his wife.]

There is nothing wrong with the syntax of the MT, but the final indirect object phrase is separated from the verb and direct object by the long clause detailing Rebecca’s genealogical background. The scribe responsible for the change must have found the

---

153 Frag. 24 12 (בתוך) and frag. 30 4 (לעיניכם).

154 The reading for all these examples is taken from MT. However, because I only discuss readings that are unique to the 4QRP mss, SP and G generally do not differ from MT with regard to the reading under discussion.
syntax confusing, and solved the problem by making the final words into an independent clause.

A final example of a minor addition may be the result of reading (and copying) a verse in light of its larger context.

Deut 3:1, "And we turned and went up the road to Bashan, and Og, King of Bashan, came out against us…"

4Q364 24 15–16, "And we went up the road to Bashan for battle, and [Og, King of Bashan, came out against] us…”

The verse according to 4Q364 indicates proleptically that the Israelites will not make it through Bashan without a fight. The addition could be viewed simply as an anticipation of the events to follow. However, it might also reflect a harmonization of the encounter with Og to the meeting with Sihon described earlier, in Deut 2:24. YHWH explicitly instructs Moses that the Israelites should go up and fight Sihon (‘הتجارב Malone, “engage him in battle’). Thus, even though Moses sends messengers to Sihon proposing a peaceful transit, both he and the reader know that warfare will follow. Since the defeats of Sihon and Og are so closely connected in the stories of the wilderness wandering, it is feasible that an ancient scribe might have reasoned that war with Og, as with Sihon, was intended from the start.

The two cases of slightly larger additions in 4Q364 also seem to reflect exegetical concerns. The first occurs in frag. 1 3:


4Q364 1 3, “Abraham begot Isaac, whom Sarah his wife bore to him.” 156

Cf. Gen 25:12, “These are the descendants of Ishmael son of Abraham, whom Hagar the Egyptian, Sarah’s maidservant, bore to Abraham.” 157

The relationship between the addition and the formulation in Gen 25:12 makes clear the logic involved: if the mother was noted in the case of Ishmael, Abraham’s son by a servant, how much more so should the mother be mentioned in the case of Isaac, Abraham’s true heir, born to his wife?

The second moderate addition also seems to fill an exegetical gap:

Gen 30:14, “Reuben went at the time of the wheat harvest, and he found mandrakes in the field.”

4Q364 4b,e i 8, “[Reuben went at the time of the wheat]t [harvest] after Jacob[b...”

Whoever was responsible for this addition must have thought that Reuben’s presence in the field required explanation: inserted into the text after the phrase “wheat harvest,” are the words “after Jacob[b,” and the addition probably continued for several more words; Tov and Crawford reconstruct 156 It should be noted that the addition may have been one or two words longer, as there is extra space at the end of line 2 when it is reconstructed according to MT.

157 The parallel is pointed out by Tov and White, DJD 13:205.
“after Jacob his father to the field.” Whether or not this reconstruction is
correct, it is clear that the addition means to indicate that Reuben was out in the field
because that is where his father was, harvesting the wheat.

Of the three cases that I have classified as large additions of a line or more, two
leave us little to go on with regard to their content and purpose. In frag. 10 7–8,
approximately one line of additional material has been added to the end of Judah’s plea
for mercy before Joseph (Gen 44:18–34), but of this addition only two words remain,
עתו ברע, “? in the wickedness of….” Similarly, two lines of new material intervene
between Exod 24:18 and 25:1 in frag. 15 3–4. The addition seems to pertain to what God
revealed to Moses during his stay atop Mt. Sinai: the two legible words on line 3 are
ורידהו לולו, “I made known to him concerning all/everything…” The sense of the
contents of line 4, however, is unclear: לַֽאֲלֹהִים לַעֲלֹת מַגָּרָה. 158

Fortunately, we are on somewhat firmer ground when it comes to the largest
addition of new material attested in 4Q364. In frag. 3 ii, six lines of otherwise unknown
text appear before the beginning of Gen 28:6 in line 7. The pericope in question deals
with the aftermath of Jacob’s theft of his father’s blessing from his brother Esau, and
Rebecca’s decision that Isaac should send Jacob away to Laban until Esau’s rage has
subsided. The extant text of the addition in 4Q364 reads as follows:

תָּראֵה אוֹתָיו 1
בְּשָׁלוֹם תָּרָא 2
עַיִּינוֹ עַל מוֹתַכָּה 3
וַיִּקְּרָא שְׁנִיכְּמָה 4
הָלָּא אַתְּ כָּל הָודָּב [רָם] 5

158 Tov and Crawford note that the final word could also be read מקֹרֶא; DJD 13:222.
him you shall see [  
you shall see in peace [  
your death, and before [your] eyes[  
both of you. And he called [  
to her all the wo[rd[  
after Jacob her son[  

The additional material begins with someone addressing someone else, as demonstrated by the 2ms verbs in lines 1–2 and the 2ms suffix in line 3. Given the context, the word מותכם, “your death,” would seem to indicate that Jacob is the addressee. The speaker, therefore, is probably Isaac or Rebecca. The few words preserved in lines 1–4 allow for the possibility that this passage constitutes a paraphrase of Rebecca’s address to Jacob in Gen 27:42–45, in which she urges him to flee from Esau. The clearest point of contact is the word שניכם at the start of line 4, which may reflect Rebecca’s statement in Gen 27:45, למה אשבלכם ביום אחד, “why should I lose both of you in a single day?” “You shall see him…you shall see in peace” (lines 1–2) could refer to Jacob’s visit to Laban, or to Jacob’s seeing Esau upon his return, once Esau’s anger has cooled. “Your death” would then most likely refer to the threat Esau poses to Jacob in the present, or possibly to a death in peace long in the future.

In contrast, starting with ויקרא in line 4 the addition seems to have involved completely new material. Now the speech of a man is reported in the third person. In the next line, a woman, presumably Rebecca, is portrayed as the recipient of “all (these?) words”: again, based on context, we can guess that Isaac or Jacob is now speaking to
Rebecca. In the final additional line, line 6, the exact sense of the extant words is ambiguous: “after Jacob her son.”

It is tempting to see in this addition a parallel to Isaac’s speech to Rebecca that occurs in precisely the same place in the patriarchal narrative in Jub 27:13–18. There, we read that, after Jacob left for Mesopotamia, Rebecca “grieved” and “wept” for her son. Isaac then reassures her that Jacob will remain unharmed because he is under the protection of God Most High. In so doing, he uses several phrases that recall the language of the addition in 4Q364 3 ii 1–4: “…until he returns to us in peace and we see him in peace” (Jub 27:16, cf. הראה בשלום, line 2); “And he will not be lost/perish” (Jub 27:17, מותכה, line 3). Furthermore, it seems that both texts conclude the new material with a statement by the narrator: “And Isaac comforted Rebecca on account of Jacob, her son, and he blessed him” (Jub 27:18); “…after Jacob her son” (4Q364 3 ii 6). Despite the points of contact, however, it is clear that we do not simply have the same addition present in both texts. The second-person verbs in 4Q364 are masculine, making it very unlikely that they refer to Rebecca. Also, Jubilees presents in the additional material only a single discourse (Isaac speaks to Rebecca), whereas in 4Q364 there seem to be two speech events: one reflected by the second-person masculine forms in lines 1–4 (which cannot refer to Rebecca), and one, seemingly described indirectly rather than quoted in full, that is introduced by the ויקרא of line 4 (and does seem to be directed at Rebecca).

Comparison of Jubilees and 4Q364 at this point thus shows that 1) they each had an addition at this point; 2) they use some of the same language in the course of this addition; but 3) there are significant differences in the structure and content of the new material. Furthermore, there is no concrete evidence remaining that would prove a close
relationship between the two texts: none of the preserved text indicates that Rebecca’s
grief is at issue in 4Q364, and a scenario where Rebecca addresses Jacob and then Jacob
replies to Rebecca is as likely on the evidence of 4Q364 as Isaac being the speaker. That
said, the presence of the same extrabiblical expression, “to see in peace,” in both texts at
the same point pushes the boundaries of coincidence and points to some sort of
relationship between the two texts. If we accept that there is a common core of material
here, we might tentatively conclude that it is Isaac who addresses words of comfort and
encouragement to Jacob in 4Q364 3 ii 1–4, and that the text then reports that he repeated
these words to his wife (lines 4–6). This still does not preclude viewing the material in
lines 1–4 as a paraphrase of Rebecca’s speech to Jacob in Gen 27:42–45: the editor might
have drawn upon the language of that speech to construct an expansion to Isaac’s speech
to Jacob in Gen 28:1–4, which currently focuses on the issue of Jacob’s marriage rather
than the threat from Esau. One might speculate that the author of Jubilees knew of such
an expansion but felt that Jacob did not need the reassurance—note Jacob’s bravado
according to Jub 27:4—and so made Rebecca the only recipient of the speech.

4.1.2 Addition of Material from Elsewhere in the Pentateuch

This compositional technique, as we saw above, occurs fairly frequently in
4Q158. It is much less common in 4Q364, with only three unique instances, one very
small and the others only slightly more extensive.159

159 It should be noted that 4Q364 4b, e ii 21–26 does contain a sizable addition from elsewhere,
which is, however, known from SP: Jacob’s account to his wives of his dream about the goats (Gen 31:11–
13) is retroverted into an account of that dream by the anonymous narrator of Genesis and inserted after
Gen 30:36. The purpose of the addition is clear: to indicate that Jacob did in fact experience the dream that
he later relates to his wives.
The very small case seems to be a case of harmonization of language:

Gen 30:33, “every one which is not speckled or spotted among the goats…”

4Q364 4b,e ii 14, “every sheep which is not speckled or spotted among the goats…”

The addition—which, admittedly, may not even be intentional—brings the verse into conformity with the formulation in the prior verse, where Jacob says, “let me pass through all your flock today, removing from it every speckled and spotted sheep.”

The first slightly larger addition from elsewhere actually occurs in the same fragment as the preceding example. It also seems intended to specify the pentateuchal verse in light of information from a nearby context.

Gen 30:26, “Give me my wives…for you well know what service I have provided you!”

4Q364 4b,e ii 2–3, “[…for well you]u know [what service I have provided you (?), fou]rteen y[ears!”

Cf. Gen 31:41, “I have served you fourteen years for your two daughters…”

The key phrase here is “fourteen years,” which occurs in known versions of the Jacob story only in Gen 31:41 (ארבוע עשר שנים). Both Gen

160 There is space for another word or two here, although additional material does not seem strictly necessary.
30:26 and 31:41 refer to Jacob’s period of servitude, but no specific amount of time is mentioned in the first instance. If the reconstruction is correct, the addition seems to function almost as a gloss on Jacob’s statement in 30:26 that specifies it in light of the second instance (and the larger narrative context): “for well you know what service I have provided you”: fourteen years! the gloss states.

The final example of addition from elsewhere in 4Q364 coordinates two parallel laws:

Deut 1:17a

לֹא תְזַכֶּר פָּנֵי בְּמַשָּׁפְט כֹּהֵן בְּגֹדֵל תַּעֲמוֹג לְאָלָיוֹד הוֹא

כִּי איש מפני תגורו לא תשמעון כגדול כקטן במשפט פתרו לא הוא אלהים לה

“Do not show partiality in judgment; you shall hear (the case of) the small as well as the great. Do not fear (any) man, for judgment belongs to God.”

4Q364 21 1–2

ופין [במשפט כוהן בגדל]>All that which is written in the first law. לֹא תְזַכֶּר פָּנֵי בְּמַשָּׁפְט כֹּהֵן בְּגֹדֵל תַּעֲמוֹג לְאָלָיוֹד הוֹא [כגדול כקטן במשפט פתרו לא הוא אלהים לה]

Do not show partiality in judgment; you shall hear (the case of) the small as well as the great. Do not fear (any) man, for judgment belongs to God.”

161 The form is technically incorrect, raising questions about the accuracy of the reconstruction. Obviously, no reconstruction is ever more than an educated guess, and the DJD editors do not defend their choice in this case, but there is some evidence that, despite the unusual form, this suggestion may be correct. The first consideration is contextual: in the context of Jacob requesting that his servitude with Laban be ended, a number involving the word עשרה seems highly likely to be “fourteen,” referring to Jacob’s total years of service. The second is paleographic: theoretically, one could argue that the preserved עשרה does not belong to a word but to an unrelated word, with the number in question simply עשרה, “ten.” However, the initial ע is written very close to the following השיד, with much less space between words than is customary, perhaps indicating that the two words were construed as a unit. The final consideration is grammatical/phonological: Elisha Qimron has noted several instances in the Qumran corpus where the numerals שבעה and שבע are used with the wrong gender, because of the weakening in the pronunciation of gutturals. As he puts it, “שבעה and שבע were pronounced alike and were interchangeable.” Qimron then cites our passage in 4Q364 as another example of this same phenomenon. Thus there is precedent for the confusion of the two forms of the numeral such that the “wrong” form appears. See Qimron, Hebrew, 25.

162 The reconstruction indicates that the additional material would have continued for several more words, to the end of line 2; perhaps part of the following motive clause in Deut 16:19 was also included (כיצדיקים דיבר אדונים, “for a bribe blinding the eyes of the wise and twists the words of the righteous”). See Tov and White, DJD 13:229.
Cf. Deut 16:19, “Do not pervert justice. Do not show partiality, and do not take a bribe…”

The editor responsible for the insertion of part of Deut 16:19 into Deut 1:17 must have noticed that both verses contain instructions to judges on how to judge with righteousness (צדק), and both forbid partiality in judging (both include the phrase לא תכיר פנים). Surely if bribe-taking was forbidden by Moses in one passage, its proscription by Moses was also intended in the other. The addition “makes official” or enshrines that interpretation in the text.

It should be noted that these instances of addition of material from elsewhere in 4Q364 function slightly differently from the additions of material from elsewhere in 4Q158. The cases in both mss are similar in that all bring two passages into (closer) connection with one another through the addition. However, in the cases in 4Q364, the connections are general and function largely at the level of vocabulary, while in 4Q158 there is a more specific focus on coordinating command and fulfillment or an event’s prediction and its occurrence.

4.1.3 Omissions

Unlike 4Q158, which had no extant cases of minuses, 4Q364 has several, mostly consisting of only a single word. However, the nature of all but one of the minuses is such that they may well represent an earlier form of the text as opposed to a later omission. Two examples will suffice. First:

Deut 2:32–33

ויצא סיחון לעראתנו הוא וכל עמו שלחיהם הקשח והרגו חוה ממינו... And Sihon came out against us—he and all his army, to
do battle—*to Jahaz*. And YHWH our God gave him over to us…"

The place-name Jahaz could have been omitted in 4Q364, it is true, but there is also a very good reason why it might have been inserted into Deut 2:32 if it had originally been absent: Jahaz is mentioned as the site of the battle against Sihon in the parallel passage in Numbers (Num 21:23). Rather than the 4Q364 reading representing an omission, it seems more likely that the reading preserved in other versions represents an addition meant to harmonize the recollection in Deuteronomy to the account in Numbers.

A second example is similar:

I see no compelling reason—either exegetical or technical—why this clause would have been omitted, while it could easily have been added by a later editor wishing
to make the date more precise. Perhaps 4Q364 here again represents the earlier reading.

As mentioned, there is one small minus in 4Q364 that is very likely to have originated in the course of the textual reworking visible in the manuscript; that is, a true omission:

Deut 10:1  יְהֹוָה, "At that time, YHWH said…"

4Q364 26b, e ii 3  יְהֹוָה, "YHWH said…”

The two lines preceding the minus in this fragment do not simply contain the end of Deuteronomy 9, but a rearrangement or addition from elsewhere that may be intended to clarify the sequence of events in Deut 9:15–29 (see further below). Given those changes, it seems likely that the words בָּעָת הָוהָה were omitted in order to create a smoother connection with the preceding text.

4.1.4 Changes: Minor Alterations, Paraphrase, and Rearrangement

Like 4Q158, 4Q364 contains a number of minor alterations. This label refers to instances of use of a different word or a different form of a word. Of the sixteen cases I have counted in 4Q364, fifteen reflect changes insignificant to the meaning of the text,

163 Tov and Crawford state: “Probably 4Q364 represents an exegetical shortening of the text,” but provide no arguments for why this should be the case; see DJD 13:226.

164 It is characteristic of 4Q364 to mark off the tetragrammaton with two preceding dots, like a modern colon.

165 The two unique minuses in 4Q364 that have not been discussed above are both minor and difficult to assess. Frag. 26b, e ii 4 lacks the indirect object לַךְ in the phrase מְצַחֵתךְ לָךְ (Deut 10:1). Frag. 24 15 reads נָעַלְתָּ and נָעַלְתָה for MT נָעַלָּ and נָעַלָה; perhaps the longer version represents a conflated or “double” reading.
some likely unintentional and some perhaps even constituting a more original reading than that of other versions. They include addition or omission of the definite article or copula, variations in spelling, and minor morphological changes. One minor alteration, however, does warrant comment:

Exod 24:13 หม่อมเมส วยอูอาล ลาย อน ระ 🏻 ลบิ ้ล ใ ้ เม ส ห์ วิ ้ ดี ม ะ ส ห์ วิ ้ ดี ม ะส ห์ วิ ้ ดี ม ะส ห์ วิ ้ ดี ม ะส

Moses and Joshua his servant arose, and Moses went up to the mountain of God.”

4Q364 14 5

‘[Moses and Joshua his] servant [arose] to go up to [the mountain] of God.”

The minor change from the 3ms converted imperfect + subject וִיעל מַשֶּׁה לַעֲלֹת מַשֶּׁה וַיִּשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּהוֹשֻׁעַ מְשָׁיָה וַיִּקְם מְשָׁיָה מִשָּׁיָה מִשָּׁיָה

“Moses and Joshua his servant arose, and Moses went up to the mountain of God.”

The minor change from the 3ms converted imperfect + subject וִיעל מַשֶּׁה לַעֲלֹת מַשֶּׁה וַיִּשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּהוֹשֻׁעַ מְשָׁיָה וַיִּקְם מְשָׁיָה מִשָּׁיָה מִשָּׁיָה

to the infinitive לַעֲלֹת מַשֶּׁה seems designed to account for Joshua’s ascent along with Moses: the text as preserved in MT and SP is unclear, since according to v. 12 Moses alone is summoned, but it is clear from v. 14 (“wait here for us”) that Moses expects Joshua to ascend with him. The mention of Joshua in v. 13 clashes with the singular verb at the beginning of the verse, וַיִּקְם, and with the later phrase וַיִּשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּהוֹשֻׁעַ מְשָׁיָה וַיִּקְם מְשָׁיָה מִשָּׁיָה מִשָּׁיָה

The scribe responsible for the change in 4Q364 smoothed out the awkward syntax of the verse by omitting the reference to Moses alone ascending. Interestingly, G attests a different solution to the same problem: it replaces וַיִּשְׂרָאֵל וַיִּהוֹשֻׁעַ מְשָׁיָה וַיִּקְם מְשָׁיָה מִשָּׁיָה מִשָּׁיָה

וַיִּקְם מְשָׁיָה מִשָּׁיָה מִשָּׁיָה with the 3m plural verb, וַיִּשְׁרָאֵל וַיִּהוֹשֻׁעַ מְשָׁיָה וַיִּקְם מְשָׁיָה מִשָּׁיָה מִשָּׁיָה

וַיִּשְׁרָאֵל וַיִּהוֹשֻׁעַ מְשָׁיָה וַיִּקְם מְשָׁיָה מִשָּׁיָה מִשָּׁיָה.

166 The reading וַיִּקְם מְשָׁיָה וַיִּשְׁרָאֵל for וַיִּקְרָא מְשָׁיָה in 4Q364 5b ii 13 (= Gen 32:31) as it stands is unremarkable; it is the last extant word on the fragment. It should be pointed out, however, that וַיִּקְרָא מְשָׁיָה also occurs at the same point in 4Q158 (frag. 1–2 7), where it introduces a major addition. Whether the same addition was present in 4Q364 is unclear; see p. 48 above.
Clear cases of more major changes, rearrangement and paraphrase, are difficult to find in 4Q364, though there are several passages that may reflect one or the other of those techniques. Before going on to them, mention can be made of the one instance in 4Q364 that can be identified as paraphrase with some confidence.

Deut 2:34

ונהלד את כל העיר שבעה והוירס את כל עיר פ嬗 והנשה והוירס לא השארו שריי "And we captured all his cities at that time, and we exterminated every city—men and the women and the children—we did not leave a survivor."

4Q364 24 8–10

8 And we] cap[t]ured all his cities at[ that time, and we exterminated]
9 all              ?         ]in them, every man and woman[     ]
10                           ] we [extermi]nated; we did not leave a survivor.

The reading of 4Q364 in line 9, “every man and woman,” constitutes a paraphrase of one part of MT, SP Deut 2:34, which read מנה והנשה. The paraphrase involves linguistic updating: the editor replaces the rare and difficult word מנה “men” with the standard term איש. Because of the lacunae, we cannot know what the rest of the intervening material looked like and how it related to Deut 2:34 (the spacing is such that 4Q364 must have had a longer version of the verse). However, enough evidence remains to demonstrate that paraphrase is attested as one of the rewriting techniques used in 4Q364.

With regard to rearrangement the situation is similarly difficult. No clear-cut cases of rearrangement are preserved, but in two interesting instances where the precise

---

167 Similar cases of replacement of rare or unusual words with more common ones are noted for SP by Weiss, ‘וילופ לשתה רדפס,’ 173–85.
nature of the reworking is unclear, rearrangement constitutes one of several possible explanations. The first appears in frag. 14.

Exod 24:11–12:

וישתו ויאכלו אלהים את ויחזו ידו לשלח לישראל בני אצילו משửa אל יהוה ויאמר: "But against the leaders of the children of Israel he did not stretch out his hand, and they looked upon God and they ate and drank. God said to Moses, “Come up to me on the mountain, and remain there, that I might give you the stone tablets, the teaching and the commandment..."

4Q364 14 1–3:

1 [trech out his hand, and they looked upon God and they ate and drank ?? ]
2 at the base of the mountain.
3 God said to Moses, “Come [up to me] on the mountain, and re[main there, that I might give you the stone tablets,]
4 the teaching and the commandment...

The phrase הבתתית ההר, “at the base of the mountain,” occurs in the Hebrew Bible only at Exod 19:17. The ש of line 1, as Tov and Crawford note, is not consistent with the text of Exod 19:16–17. It is also inconsistent with the preceding passage in Exod 24:9–11. The only word beginning with ש in those three verses is שלחה in v. 11. As the presentation above shows, taking the ש to represent שלחה at the end of v. 11a yields a line-length that is much too short. Thus this reconstruction may not be correct, and even if it is we should reckon with additional material at the end of frag. 14 line 1. Tov and Crawford do not consider the possibility that the ש might represent Exod 24:11. Instead, they suggest that this fragment may represent a version in which material from Exodus 19 was
combined with material from Exodus 24, noting that in many ways the two chapters are parallel. Such a combination of materials from two places into a single whole would constitute a type of rearrangement. On the other hand, if Exodus 19 in its original state also appeared in this manuscript, then the repetition of elements from it here would rather suggest an *addition* of material from elsewhere.\(^{168}\) Yet it is not at all clear to me that Tov and Crawford’s suggestion is correct. It should be noted that the only evidence of the presence of material from Exodus 19 is the phrase נֶחֶשׁ הַר בָּתֹאָת, itself. The שׁ in line 1 constitutes evidence that there was *not* a large block of material from Exodus 19 present at this point, since it is not consistent with the passage immediately preceding the phrase נֶחֶשׁ הַר.\(^{169}\) Of course the שׁ could represent material from elsewhere in ch. 19, but it is just as likely that the lacuna preceding line 2 contained completely new material. An even more likely scenario, however, is that the שׁ simply represents שלחַ of Exod 24:11. In this case, there would still be a change to the text of Exodus at this point, but it is likely to be no more than a moderate addition or addition from elsewhere. The point of such an addition may have been to explain precisely where the banquet described in v. 11, where the elders see the God of Israel and eat and drink in God’s presence, took place. Use of the words נֶחֶשׁ הַר to indicate this location would certainly strengthen

\(^{168}\) Tov and Crawford do not address this issue directly, though their wording seems to suggest that they mean that 4Q364 has created a single version of the episode that combines elements of both chapters; see DJD 13:221-22. This would imply to me rearrangement as opposed to addition from elsewhere (since the original “source” of the language would no longer be included). Tov and Crawford do not pursue the issue further, though their idea would seem to have major implications for the way the Sinai pericope would have been structured in 4Q364: If Exodus 19 and 24 are combined into a single unit, where are the revelation of the Decalogue and the Covenant Code located within the narrative?

\(^{169}\) In her recent monograph, Crawford recognizes this issue, suggesting that instead of a juxtaposition of Exodus 19 and 24 we are dealing with “an otherwise unknown harmonization.” See Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 43-44.
the parallel between Exodus 19 and 24: in both, a larger group (the people/the elders) remains at the base of the mountain while Moses ascends further in order to receive the divine laws. But the integration need not go farther than that.

While this more moderate interpretation strikes me as the most plausible, Tov and Crawford’s suggestion of some sort of larger integration of Exodus 19 material into Exodus 24 cannot be ruled out. Thus, in this instance, the state of the text precludes a firm decision between rearrangement, a (large) addition from elsewhere, a large addition of new material with only two words, הנחתה ההר, added from elsewhere, or a moderate (half-line) addition of new material or material from elsewhere.

In a second case in which the precise nature of the reworking is unclear, rearrangement is perhaps a more likely option. In frag. 26b, e ii, line 3 begins with Deut 10:1, and the fragment appears to follow the biblical text closely from that point. Lines 1–2, however, diverge from known versions:

The few words in lines 1–2 manifestly do not come from the few verses preceding Deut 10:1—in fact, parts of these verses, Deut 9:27–29, are preserved in frag. 26c–d. Tov and Crawford tentatively identify the words in line 1 as Deut 9:21, which describes Moses’ disposal of the golden calf:

170 I have omitted Tov and Crawford’s reconstructions from this transcription, so as to avoid prejudicing the interpretation of the passage.
“…into dust and I cast [its dust into the stream which ran down from the mountain].”

This identification is certainly possible. However, the word אשליך also occurs in Deut 9:17, where it describes Moses’ actions as he hurls down and smashes the tablets that God gave him on the mountain. As for line 2, the extant material approximates the contents of several verses in Deuteronomy 9, but is not identical to any of them:

4Q364 26b, e ii

Deut 9:18

Deut 9:25

Deut 9:26

One might suggest that these two lines represent a rearrangement whereby Deut 9:21 and 18 or 25 have been moved immediately prior to 10:1. Two difficulties arise from this proposal. First, as the above chart shows, line 2 cannot be directly identified with either verse. Second and more importantly, the logic of moving v. 21, in which Moses destroys the calf, to a position immediately preceding 10:1, is not entirely clear. However, these difficulties may not be insurmountable. Perhaps, as Moshe Bernstein suggests for other 4QRP fragments, the key is not what brings two passages together as much as what might cause the removal of the material that originally appeared between them. In other words, Deut 9:21 might have ended up so near to 10:1 not because of

171 It should be noted that the reading ר֯, which Tov and Crawford reconstruct as part of לעפר, may not be correct. From the photograph in DSSEL (PAM 43.360), the dark spot that Tov and Crawford interpret as the far left edge of ר looks more like shadows than ink.

172 Tov and Crawford tentatively identify the two lines as Deut 9:21 and 25; see DJD 13:239.

173 Bernstein, "What Has Happened to the Laws?", 41.
any intrinsic relation between the two verses, but because the intervening material was moved elsewhere. In fact there are good reasons why this might have happened in this case. Deut 9:22–24 is a digression that recounts other episodes of Israel’s rebellion and, as such, does not fit directly into the story of Israel’s sin with the calf, Moses’ intercession before God, and the creation of new tablets. Deut 9:26–29 represents the contents of Moses’ prayer for mercy before God; oddly, they are separated from the account of that prayer in vv. 18–20. It is possible that the chapter was rearranged such that vv. 26–29 were joined to vv. 18–20 in some way, and vv. 22–24 were also moved to a different location, leaving vv. 21 and 25. There is some physical evidence for this in 4Q364: Deut 9:22–24 appear in lines 1–5 of frag. 26a ii, but they apparently were not followed by v. 25, as the few letters preserved in line 6 do not match that verse. In its new context proximate to 10:1, v. 25 (now taking a slightly altered form) would indicate that it was during his second 40 days and nights on the mountain that God commanded Moses to make new tablets and an ark for them.174

Another solution is possible that involves addition from elsewhere rather than large-scale rearrangement. If the word אשליך in line 1 is taken as referring to the destruction of the tablets instead of the disposal of the calf, we could view the two lines as a repetitive insertion meant to return attention to the issue of the tablets that were

174 It is interesting that the last line of frag. 26a ii (Deut 9:22–24), and the first line of frag. 27 (Deut 10:6–7) both contain unidentified material. Is it possible that Deut 9:22–24 were relocated after Deut 10:5? If this were to be correct, then frags 26b i, 26c–d, and 26b, e ii would all come between the two columns of frag. 26a (which contains Deut 9:6–7 in col. i and Deut 9:22–24 + in col. ii). Although the labels 26b i and 26b, e ii might imply that this is impossible, there is in fact no clear connection between these two fragments. Frag. 26b contains only one small vertical stroke representing its column ii. Tov and Crawford identify this stroke as the ה that starts line 8 of frag. 26e, and thus refer to that section of text as frag. 26b, e ii. However, the vertical stroke in col ii of frag. 26b could belong anywhere—nothing but a presumption that the text generally followed MT would require that the two fragments be associated.
smashed, thus preparing the way for the creation of new ones in chapter 10. The reader would be reminded that the tablets were smashed (cf. 9:17) and that Moses then prayed before God on behalf of the people (cf. 9:18). As in the first scenario, the mention of Moses’ prayer would serve to make clear that it was in the course of that intercession that he received the instructions from God to make new tablets. Perhaps we might even speculate that this connection was made clear enough to render redundant the first two words of Deut 10:1, ב主要集中, which are absent in 4Q364.

4.1.5 Summary

The discussion in the previous pages has indicated that 4Q364 has much in common with 4Q158 as regards its reworking of the pentateuchal text, but also differs in some respects. The similarities in compositional technique should be clear: 4Q364 contains additions of various sizes, both of new material and of material from elsewhere; preserves numerous minor alterations; presents one case of paraphrase; and otherwise manipulates the pentateuchal text in major ways (see especially the difficult-to-interpret changes pertaining to Exodus 24 in frag. 14 1–2 and Deuteronomy 9–10 in frag. 26b, e ii 1–2). Another similarity worth pointing out is that both texts preserve major changes also known from the Samaritan Pentateuch, indicating that they both used as their base text a version of the Pentateuch that was already pre-Samaritan in type.175

Despite the general similarity of approach, there are some noticeable differences between 4Q364 and 4Q158. First, it is striking that 4Q364 appears to contain several cases of shorter readings that may well be original, while 4Q158 contains none. This may be evidence that 4Q364 used as a Vorlage a somewhat earlier form of the pentateuchal text. 4Q158 also does not contain any minuses that are likely to have originated in the course of reworking; there are only two instances where I posited haplography to account for an apparently shorter reading in 4Q158. On the other hand, 4Q364 seems to contain one genuine omission, even if it is short (*תוה* בָּעַת in frag. 26b, e ii 3).

Second, despite the occurrence of the same compositional techniques in 4Q158 and 4Q364, large extant changes are not as frequent in 4Q364. Despite preserving only 95 inscribed lines compared to 273 in 4Q364 (about 35% as many), 4Q158 preserves just as many major additions, more and larger additions from elsewhere, and more cases of paraphrase. Admittedly, if 4Q364 were better-preserved, the picture might be somewhat different: there are 10 cases where the extant text differs from known versions but the type of change cannot be identified, and 11 cases where reconstruction suggests that differences must have existed, although they are no longer preserved. I have not discussed these cases because they are so ambiguous. On the other hand, major changes that stretch over multiple lines are usually detectable, and usually something can be said about the nature of the change. It appears therefore, based on the available evidence, that 4Q364 represents a somewhat less extensive reworking of the Pentateuch than that found in 4Q158.
4.2 4Q365 (+ 4Q365a)

4Q365, in its extant form, is similar in size to 4Q364. It is the only one of the 4QRP manuscripts to contain material from each of the five books of the Pentateuch. The 38 numbered fragments primarily reflect Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, with one fragment reflecting Genesis and one Deuteronomy. It is somewhat better preserved than 4Q364, averaging 4.9 extant or partially extant words per inscribed line.\textsuperscript{176}

The heading for this section indicates that I operate under the presumption that the five fragments given the siglum 4Q365a belong to the same composition as that reflected in 4Q365. The 4Q365a fragments were originally grouped together with 4Q365 by John Strugnell, and all physical signs—handwriting, leather, margins—indicate that they belong to the same manuscript. The later editors of the material, Tov and Crawford, separated them out because they do not contain any biblical text. Because of significant overlaps with the Temple Scroll in some (but not all) of the fragments, 4Q365a was given the title “4QTemple?”\textsuperscript{177} Others have pointed out, however, that this identification is suspect in that it prioritizes the editors’ conception of what a text “should” contain over the physical evidence of the fragments themselves. There is no reason to assume that a text generally characterized by close interaction with the pentateuchal text could not also contain substantial new material.\textsuperscript{178} I will therefore include the 4Q365a fragments in the following analysis.

\textsuperscript{176} This figure includes 4Q365a; see below.

\textsuperscript{177} For an explanation of the reasoning involved, see Sidnie White, "4Q365a," in \textit{Qumran Cave 4, VIII} (by Harold Attridge, et al.; DJD 13; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 319-34, at pp. 319-20.

\textsuperscript{178} See especially Florentino García Martinez, "Multiple Literary Editions of the Temple Scroll?," in \textit{The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After Their Discovery} (eds. Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov,
4.2.1 Addition of New Material

As is the case for 4Q158 and 4Q364, 4Q365 contains a number of additions of various sizes. The minor additions (of just a word or two), also as we have seen elsewhere, tend to be of little significance. Although some of the nine instances I have identified are ambiguous, several follow a pattern evidenced by the other manuscripts: additions that make the meaning of a clause more explicit or increase its readability. These include:

- Num 3:28: ְבֵּכְסַפְר כָלָּנָךְ, "by the number of each male…"
- 4Q365 27 4: ְבֵּכְסַפְר שְׁמֵיהֶם כָלָּנָךְ, "by the number of the names of each male…"
- Num 13:18b: אֲנָה הָעְמָה יְשָׁב עַל הָהָוָךְ הָוָא הָרָפָה, "And whether the people who dwell upon it (are) strong or weak"
- 4Q365 32 5–6: אֲנָה הָעְמָה יְשָׁב עַל הָהָוָךְ הָוָא הָרָפָה, "And whether the people who dwell upon it are strong or weak"
- Num 13:20: וּלְקַחְוָם הָאָרֶץ וְהָתַּחֵזְקַתָם מַפְרִי... "Be bold, and take some of the fruit of the land…"
- 4Q365 32 8: וּלְקַחְוָם אָרֶץ וּמַפְרִי הָאָרֶץ, "Be bold, and take in your hand some of the fruit of the land…"

Of the four additions of moderate size, one is clearly dittography:

Exod 39:8, “and they made the breastplate…”

4Q365 12 iii 7, “and they made the breastplate and they made the breastplate…”

Of the remaining three moderate additions, two are difficult to characterize due to their poor preservation. The first occurs in the context of the Israelites’ flight from Egypt:

Exod 14:19b, “And the pillar of cloud moved from in front of them…”

4Q365 6a i 9–10, “and the pillar of cloud moved from the camp of Egypt to be in the camp of Israel…”

The addition would have continued for another several words into line 10. Clearly an editor wished to elaborate on the movements of the pillar of cloud, but the exact nature of the addition is unclear, as is the meaning of the implication that the pillar of cloud had been in the camp of the Egyptians—a statement that seems to be at odds with the pentateuchal narrative as otherwise known.

The second case is even more obscure:

Lev 27:34–Num 1:1, “These are the commands that YHWH gave to Moses for the children of Israel on Mt. Sinai. YHWH spoke to Moses in the wilderness of Sinai…”

4Q365 26 1–4, [ךָלֶל בָּנֶי יִשְׂרָאֵל] 1
[ךָלֶל בָּנֶי יִשְׂרָאֵל] 2
[ךָלֶל בָּנֶי יִשְׂרָאֵל] 3
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Since line 1 contains the end of the book of Leviticus, and Num 1:1 begins in line 4, there must have been some additional material in lines 2–3. Line 3 appears to have contained an interval, or perhaps was entirely blank. What is preserved of line 2 reads שְבֵתָם, the meaning of which is entirely unclear. One could suggest לשבתם, “for their dwelling just as...”, but even this does not get us very far.

There is one case in which we are on firmer ground:

Exod 14:10 ...והנה מצרים טשו אתיריה ויראה ומעד... “And see, Egypt was pursuing them, and they were very afraid...”

It seems clear that an editor has added a note meant either to clarify the identity of the “Egypt” that was pursuing Israel (namely, Egypt’s army), or to emphasize for the reader the strength of the pursuing army. That Pharaoh assembled 600 chariots is stated in Exod 14:10, making this partially an addition from elsewhere, but there is no direct source for the thousand(s of) horses. Also, since line 2 is the last on the fragment, we
have no way of knowing the actual size of this addition—I have classified it as
“moderate” based on the extant amount of additional material.

4Q365 is distinguished by several major additions. One (or more) of these, of
course, is the material currently classified as 4Q365a. Frags 2 and 5 of 4Q365a each
contain parts of two columns. It is very unlikely that the two both represent the same two
columns. Therefore, the additional material in 4Q365a seems to have covered at least
four columns. That all this material appeared in one long addition is of course not certain,
but is suggested by the fact that all of the fragments, outside of frag. 1, deal with the
construction of a Temple, its courts, and its appurtenances. Frag. 1, on the other hand,
mentions “the festival of Mazzot,” commandments, and burnt offerings, but does not
contain construction information. It perhaps was originally located within the context of
sacrificial or festival legislation, although it may also have belonged to the construction
section: the Temple Scroll sometimes mentions festivals and sacrifices in the course of its
instructions for the Temple courts.

Elsewhere I have discussed in some detail the reasons why an ancient editor
might wish to add instructions for building a Temple to a revised or rewritten version of

180 The main reason for this is that both columns of frag. 2 have parallels in the Temple Scroll: 2 i
corresponds to 11QT 38, which contains the beginning of the instructions for the Temple’s middle court,
while 2 ii corresponds to 11QT 41, which discusses the outer court. While the missing upper part of 2 ii
(the fragment preserves the bottom margin of both columns) probably could not have contained all of the
intervening material, it is highly likely that it continued to parallel 11QT on the subject of the Temple’s
courts. Frag. 5, on the other hand, contains material with no parallel in 11QT, and does not seem to deal
with the Temple courts (col. i mentions “wheels” and “boards,” while col. ii, very fragmentary, mentions
“the calculations,” המחשבות). On the relationship between 4Q365a frag. 2 i–ii and 11QT, see White, DJD

181 See e.g 11QT 38:1–4; 43:1–12.
the Pentateuch. The answer depends somewhat upon whether 4Q365 was envisioned as an expanded copy of the Pentateuch or as a new, independent literary work, a question I do not want to engage here. If 4Q365 represents a new literary work, then “the sky’s the limit” in terms of imagining a context for the combination of Temple instructions with pentateuchal material: perhaps, just as 11QT represents the plan for a utopian Temple accompanied by laws to be followed by the community surrounding the Temple, 4Q365 reflects a composition in which instructions for an ideal Temple were accompanied by a version of the Torah as a whole. On the other hand, if 4Q365 represents a new edition of the Pentateuch rather than a new literary work, an editor may have perceived a gap in the legislation of the Pentateuch: while the Torah contains instructions for the wilderness Tabernacle as well as numerous laws that are to be obeyed only after Israel’s entrance into the land (see Deuteronomy), it presents no blueprint for the permanent Temple that is to be built in the land. The editor may then have sought to fill this gap by inserting such instructions right into the Torah itself.

While the 4Q365a materials constitute by far the largest additions of new material in 4Q365, the extant fragments reveal two other major additions. The first of these (frag. 6a, c ii 1–7) has been inserted prior to Exod 15:22, which begins in frag. 6a, c, ii 8. Because of its location and because it echoes some of the themes and vocabulary of the Song of the Sea in Exod 15:1–19, the new material seems to represent an expansion of the song Miriam sings according to Exod 15:20–21. In contrast to the version known

182 Zahn, "4QRevised Pentateuch Manuscripts," 335-37.
from elsewhere, in which Miriam’s song consists of only one line mimicking the first line of Moses’ song, 4Q365 seems to give Miriam a proper song of her own:

1 you despised ‘[
2 for the majesty of[ ]/’[
3 You are great, a deliverer ’[
4 The hope of the enemy has perished and nsh[
5 They have perished in mighty waters, the enemy[
6 Extol the one who raises up,[ a ransom you gave (?)
7 the one who does gloriously.183

The words to this new song seem partly based on the Song of the Sea, but partly drawn from other praise language. Parallels to Exodus 15 include the use of the root גאה (lines 2, 7; Exod 15:1, 7) and the word גדול (describing YHWH in line 3 and YHWH’s arm in Exod 15:16). The phrase אדירים מים occurs in line 5 and in Exod 15:10, and לו מרים in line 6 echoes ורוממה in Exod 15:2. On the other hand, terms like יתבז (“you despised”), אביו תוק את שוה (ממשי = מתיישא, and אביו תוק את שוה, are not familiar from Exodus 15, though all obviously fit the context of the victory at the sea.184 Miriam’s song thus echoes Moses’ song, but does not simply repeat it, invoking its own imagery as well.

---

183 With minor modifications, the translation follows Tov and White, DJD 13:270.

184 For the occurrence of some of these phrases within the Hebrew Bible, see Tov and White, DJD 13:271.
The final major addition in 4Q365 follows the end of the Holiness Code’s festival calendar in Leviticus 23 (frag. 23 1–3 = Lev 23:42–44). In frag. 23 4, 4Q365 first has Lev 24:1, as we would expect ("YHWH spoke to Moses, saying…"). It also begins Lev 24:2 in accordance with other versions: “command the children of Israel…” But from there on, whereas Leviticus commands that the people procure pure olive oil for the sanctuary lamp, 4Q365 moves in a new direction.

4 YHWH spoke to Moses, saying: command the children of Israel, saying, “When you come into the land that I am giving to you as an inheritance, and you dwell upon it in surety, you shall bring (pieces of) wood for the burnt offering and for all the work which you shall build for me in the land, to arrange them upon the altar of burnt offering; and the calves for Passover sacrifices and for sacrifices of well-being and for thank-offerings and for free-will offerings and for burnt offerings, daily [?

4Q365 begins by commanding that, after the Israelites are settled “in surety” in the land, they bring wood for the various needs of the Temple “which you shall build for
me in the land.” After detailing a variety of uses to which this wood will be put (various offerings; doors), the text mentions “the festival of new oil” and then seems to indicate that different tribes will bring wood for the Temple on different days (e.g. Levi brings wood on the first day; line 10).

There is much to be discussed in this striking addition. First, while the majority of the preserved text does not show a close connection to any particular biblical passage, the exception is the initial temporal clause of the addition: “When you come into the land that I am giving to you as an inheritance, and you dwell upon it in surety…” (lines 4–5). Although similar clauses, variations of the so-called “Landnahme formula,” often introduce laws in the latter books of the Pentateuch, the closest match (and the only one containing the word נחלות, “inheritance”) is Deut 26:1: Now, when you come into the land that YHWH your God is giving to you as an inheritance…” This verse makes good sense as a source for the introduction to a command to bring wood to the sanctuary, as Deut 26:1–11 likewise commands the Israelites to bring the produce of the land (here firstfruits instead of wood) to the “place that YHWH your God will choose.”

Deut 26:1, however, does not contain the phrase ישתבשו עליה נחלות, “and you dwell upon it in surety.” To be sure, this phrase may simply have been included as a generic expression appropriate to the context, without any particular scriptural source in mind. On the other hand, it may allude to specific verses that the composer of this addition viewed as appropriate to the context. The most likely of these is Deut 12:9–11:

For you have not yet entered (בארה) into the rest and the inheritance (נחלות) that YHWH your God is giving to you, but when you cross over the Jordan and you
dwell in the land which YHWH your God is giving you as an inheritance, and he gives you rest from all your surrounding enemies and you dwell in surety (יִשְׁבַּתֵּם יָשָׁב), then to the place which YHWH your God will choose to make his name dwell, there shall you bring all that I have commanded you: your burnt offerings and your sacrifices; your tithes and the offering of your hands…

These verses constitute an expanded version of the Landnahme formula, whose more typical shorter form we saw in Deut 26:1. This is the only instance of the formula that contains the pair יִשָּׁב יָשָׁב. That an editor might have had these particular verses in mind while composing a section on the wood offering is unsurprising: like Deut 26:1, they introduce a command to bring offerings to the sanctuary. Perhaps it is also significant that this passage in Deuteronomy 12 is the first mention in the Pentateuch of the Temple (of course referred to obliquely as “the place that YHWH will choose,” in accordance with Deuteronomy’s literary setting). 4Q365 23 6 explicitly associates the wood offering with “the Temple that you will build for me in the land”: the provision of wood for the sanctuary is not associated with the wilderness Tabernacle but directly with the future Temple in the land. Thus it does not seem out of place to recognize in the words לֶבֶטַח עֵלֵיהֶם ישְׁבַּתֵּם an allusion to the first and most extensive reference to that Temple in the Pentateuch. An astute reader or hearer would undoubtedly also have made a connection with the notice in 1 Kgs 5:5 that ישְׁבַּתֵּם יִשְׂרָאֵל יְהוֹדָה לֶבֶטַח וֹלוֹתָה…כִּלְיָמֶים שלֹמָה, “Judah and Israel dwelt in surety…all the days of Solomon,” a notice that sets the stage for the beginning of Solomon’s temple-building project in 1 Kgs 5:15.185 Thus the

---

185 I owe to David Carr the identification of the first part of this temporal clause with Deut 26:1; see David Carr, "Method in Determination of Direction of Dependence: An Empirical Test of Criteria Applied to Exodus 34,11-26 and its Parallels," in Gottes Volk am Sinai: Untersuchungen zu Ex 32-34 und Dtn 9-10 (eds. Matthias Köckert and Erhard Blum; Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie 18; Gütersloh: Kaiser, 2001), 107-40, at p. 131. Carr, however, identifies Lev
opening clause of this major addition is constructed out of scriptural language that recalls for the reader passages dealing with the Temple and the offerings required for its maintenance.

With regard to the main contents of the additional material, the wood offering and the feast of new oil, we are fortunate to have access to some further information. According to the Temple Scroll, the feast of new oil (variously referred to as לשון יָאֹחר or שַׁפָּר שֵׁדֶר) is the last in a series of first-fruits festivals, taking place fifty days after the festival of the first-fruits of wine. The date given for "הָנַעֲדַשׁ הָשָׁמָר" in 4Q327—the 22nd of the sixth month—is likely the date envisioned by the Temple Scroll as well. Immediately following the feast of new oil in 11QT 23 is a six-day festival in which two tribes bring their offerings each day. No reference to this festival as the wood offering is preserved in this section of the main copy of the Temple Scroll. However, 11QT does preserve the word עָצִים at the end of a list of feast days upon which the tithe may be eaten (43:3–4).

25:18b, 19b as the source of the phrase לֹֽא תֹּאשִׁי עַל אֱרָֽצָךְ וְיַשְׁבֵּתוּם. Although these verses do contain very similar language (ישבשתו על הארץ in 18b; וישבשתו על הארץ in 19b), their context—the sabbatical and jubilee years—is not particularly relevant to the content of 4Q365 23. Deut 12:10, despite the absence there of the minor word עליה, seems more likely because of its closer parallel in content to the addition.

For discussion of the first-fruits festivals in the Temple Scroll, see Yadin, Temple Scroll, 1.99-122.

The calendrical document originally numbered 4Q327 was later identified with 4Q394 (4QMTM) and published as part of 4Q394 in DJD 21. However, subsequent research has made clear that the 4Q327 fragments do not belong to 4Q394 but come from another manuscript. See, with literature, James C. VanderKam, Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time (London: Routledge, 1998), 75.

The text, with Yadin’s reconstruction, reads as follows: "בְּיוֹמֵי הַבְּכָרִים לַדָּגֶן לְהָנַעַדְשׁ לְאָשָׁר לְמַעֲשָׂר נֵטְנֵיו. ... " See Yadin, Temple Scroll, 2.182.
Furthermore, 11QT<sup>b</sup> provides some more information in one small fragment that seems to fit into the lacuna at the top of col. 23 in 11QT (11Q20 col. 6 = frag. 10e). It reads:<sup>189</sup>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ויהוה וּז</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>וּבָשָׂרְךָ יְשַׁש</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>וּצָעֲשׂ בַּעֲלוֹת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>יַעֲשׂ בַּעֲלוֹת</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This transcription is my own, based on the plate in DSSEL (PAM 43.977). It does not differ from others in the identification of letters; only in the certainty attributed to some readings.

1 [ ]m
2 [ ]and Judah and on[ 3 ]on the fourth day Issa[char
4 [ ]and Naphtali [ 5 [ ]the wood as a burnt offering for[ 6 [ ]two goats for[ 7 [ ]‘wl

This fragment seems to have presented a brief list of which tribes were to present on which day, and the mention of הֹעֲצִים in line 5 suggests strongly that a feast dedicated to the wood offering is indeed the subject of 11QT 23–25. The complete section seems to have first introduced the wood offering and discussed the day-by-day bringing of wood to the altar, and then moved into the order of animal sacrifices for the day. This can be seen from the mention of שָׂנִים, “two goats,” in the next-to-last line of the 11QT<sup>b</sup> fragment. These two words actually overlap with 11QT 23:4, from which point 11QT continues with lengthy descriptions of the animal sacrifices that each of the twelve tribes are to offer over the course of the six days. Presumably the tribes brought their animal sacrifices on the same day on which they brought their contribution of wood.<sup>190</sup>

---

<sup>189</sup> This transcription is my own, based on the plate in DSSEL (PAM 43.977). It does not differ from others in the identification of letters; only in the certainty attributed to some readings.

<sup>190</sup> For a complete discussion of the wood offering in the Temple Scroll, see Yadin, Temple Scroll, 1.122-31, 2.102-11.
Obviously the Temple Scroll presents a substantial parallel to 4Q365 frag. 23 at this point: wood is presented tribe by tribe over the course of a number of days, the order of tribes (as far as it is extant) is the same in both texts, and the wood offering is associated with the feast of new oil. Since frag. 23 breaks off before the end of the list of tribes, we have no idea how it continued: perhaps it contained the more elaborate sacrificial instructions present in 11QT; perhaps not. However, there are two clear differences between the two texts. First, although 4Q365 mentions the feast of new oil in 23 9, it cannot have contained anything like the extensive legislation for that feast found in 11QT, at least not at this point in the text. Frag. 23 goes directly from the end of the Sukkot legislation in Leviticus 23 to the wood offering. The feast of new oil seems to be referred to, but not explained or discussed—an interesting fact given that it, like the wood offering, is not mentioned in the familiar versions of the Pentateuch. Second, the introduction to the wood offering in 4Q365 23 4–8 cannot have been paralleled in the Temple Scroll: there is not room at the top of 11QT col. 23 for these additional lines. The overlaps are such that there must have been some sort of literary relationship between this fragment and 11QT, but the discrepancies suggest that the authors/editors of both texts shaped the material in their own way.

Two additional points are necessary. First, it appears that the impetus for giving the provision of wood for the Temple a place among the festival laws of the Pentateuch may have been derived originally from Neh 10:35. 191 Here, as part of the covenantal document to which the priests, Levites, and people witness, we read, “We have also cast

191 See Yadin, Temple Scroll, 1.124.
lots regarding the offering of wood (ה зрנים) — the priests, the Levites, and the people—to bring (it) to the house of our God by ancestral houses at fixed times (עתים) year by year, to burn upon the altar of YHWH our God as is written in the Torah (כתובה בחרד).” Nehemiah claims that the wood offering is prescribed by the Torah. However, no such legislation occurs in the laws of the Pentateuch as they have come down to us. It would not have been beyond the reach of a later editor to conclude on the basis of Nehemiah that such a command did indeed belong to the corpus of laws revealed at Sinai, and thus to insert the legislation into the written record of that revelation. On the other hand, perhaps an editor earlier than Nehemiah inserted the wood offering into a copy of the Pentateuch on the basis of his own knowledge of a tradition about the wood offering. If this is the case, Nehemiah’s Torah may indeed have contained a law concerning the wood offering. The figure ultimately responsible for the change may have been the person responsible for 4Q365, or the author of the Temple Scroll, or an earlier interpreter whose work then served as a source for both 4Q365 and 11QT.

---

192 On the “pseudonymous” attribution of non-pentateuchal laws to the Torah in Ezra and Nehemiah, with mention of the influence such a practice had on “Rewritten Bible” compositions, see Hindy Najman, "Torah of Moses: Pseudonymous Attributions in Second Temple Writings," in The Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity: Studies in Language and Tradition (ed. Craig A. Evans; JSPSup 33; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 202-16.

193 This may be somewhat less plausible given that Ezra-Nehemiah also attributes other non-pentateuchal laws, such as prescriptions for the divisions of the priests and Levites and policies for dealing with foreign wives, to the Torah. Of course all of these laws may have already been in whatever copy of the Torah the author of Ezra-Nehemiah was using, but it seems more likely that Mosaic status was claimed for these laws rather than assumed; that is, that the attribution to Torah is tendentious. See further Najman, "Torah of Moses."

194 This question may be related to the issue of when and why the feasts of the firstfruits of wine and oil were developed. The mention of the latter in 4Q365 and in the calendrical document 4Q327 suggests that they were not simply invented by the author of the Temple Scroll.
Second and finally, there is an intriguing aspect to the placement of this addition. It is not inserted into the festival calendar itself, even though the reference to מועש היצהר suggests that the wood offering was viewed by the person responsible for 4Q365 as occurring at a fixed point in the calendar. Rather, it is located after the conclusion to the festival calendar. The intriguing part is that the law displaced by the addition—the original continuation of Lev 24:2—commands the Israelites to bring “pure beaten olive oil” (כתית זך זית שמן) for the maintenance of the menorah that stood in the Temple. The correspondence to the wood offering is manifest: both involve procuring supplies for the daily operations of the Temple. The placement of the wood offering proximate to the command to bring oil for the Temple therefore makes sense—except that, apart from the brief reference to מועש היצהר, no mention is made of this command in frag. 23! The addition seems to have displaced the very text that prompted its placement at this point, only a vestige of which now remains. No good explanation for this is obvious—we could assume that the commands about the oil simply came after those for the wood offering, though the mention of מועש היצהר makes it sound like this feast has already been discussed. Perhaps full discussion of the provision of oil was located elsewhere in 4Q365—if so, no evidence of it has been preserved.

4.2.2 Addition of Material from Elsewhere

Addition from elsewhere in 4Q365, as was the case for 4Q364, is not nearly as common as in 4Q158. The two clear instances also share with the cases in 4Q364 a concern to harmonize the language or vocabulary of two passages, as opposed to 4Q158’s
concern to coordinate a command and its fulfillment or an event and its recollection. The first instance is very minor:

Lev 25:9  “You shall sound the blasting trumpet…on the Day of Atonement you shall sound the trumpet in all of your land.”

By referring to the שופר הרעה at the end of the verse as well as at the beginning, 4Q365 achieves consistency of formulation throughout the verse.

The second instance is more substantial, but harmonizes in a similar way.

Exod 15:19b–20  “and the children of Israel walked on dry land in the midst of the sea. And Miriam took…”

Cf. Exod 14:29  “and the children of Israel walked on dry land in the midst of the sea, and the water was (like) a wall to them on their right and on their left.”

In 4Q365, Exod 15:19b matches Exod 14:29 exactly. Such a harmonization may even have been done unconsciously: a scribe copying the shorter formulation may have simply continued as if it were the longer one without giving it a thought. On the other
hand, an editor may have felt that the two statements should match and added the extra section deliberately.

4.2.3 Omissions

Like 4Q364, 4Q365 presents several cases of minuses. For none of these is there any compelling evidence that they represent deliberate omissions. Furthermore, it is usually impossible to discern whether the minuses represent true omissions by an editor—intentional or otherwise—or simply witness to an earlier stage of the text. For example:

Lev 26:28b, “I myself shall chastise you sevenfold for your sins”

4Q365 25 13, “[I shall chastise ]you sevenfold for your sins[”

There is no compelling reason to regard the intensifier *, אני’, present in MT and other witnesses but absent in 4Q365, as an addition, but equally there is no clear technical or exegetical reason why it should be omitted. The two options seem equally likely.

The same can be said of a slightly larger minus:

Exod 15:22, “Moses had Israel set out from the Sea of Reeds, and they went out into the wilderness of Shur, and they went…”

4Q365 6a ii 8, “Moses had Israel set out from the sea, and they went….”
One could suggest that an editor spliced in the reference to the sea of reeds in order to lend greater precision to the narrative, but the only real argument for this position is that it is hard to understand why such a phrase would be omitted.

The cases where minuses in 4Q365 can be judged to be later than known versions all seem to be the result of scribal errors. In the following case, for instance, the longer reading found in MT and elsewhere makes much more sense:

Exod 39:1

"they made finely-wrought garments for serving in the holy place"

4Q365 12 iii 1

"they made finely-wrought garments in the holy place"

Error also seems to be involved in the omission of two whole verses, Exod 39:6–7, in line 7 of frag. 12 iii. Tov and Crawford remark that “4Q365 probably shortened the text, although homoioteleuton is not impossible.” However, vv. 5 and 7 each end with the same phrase, “just as YHWH commanded Moses,” and vv. 6 and 8 both begin with the same word, “and he made,” making conditions perfect for a scribal eyeskip. Furthermore, no obvious reason presents itself for why an editor would wish to remove the omitted material, which pertains to the onyx stones that were set into the shoulder-pieces of the Ephod. The burden of proof is therefore upon those who would see this omission as anything other than homoioteleuton.

---


196 This statement and others like it in the DJD 13 edition of 4QRP seem to be the result of the rigidness with which the editors kept the 4QRP texts, which they viewed as “exegetical” and therefore non-biblical, in a category separate from that of copies of biblical books. Rather than viewing the 4QRP manuscripts as subject to essentially the same scribal processes that affected biblical books, there is a
4.2.4 Changes: Minor Alterations, Paraphrase, and Rearrangement

The extant portions of 4Q365 are especially well-endowed with those minor alterations of a word or word form which we have also encountered in 4Q158 and 4Q364. I have counted 52 cases of minor alteration, largely (as usual) of little significance to the meaning of the passage at hand, and many possibly unintentional or even perhaps original. However, some changes do point to interesting issues. Several minor variations in wording smooth out differences between a particular phrase and its surrounding context:

Exod 39:14, “And the stones, according to the names of the children of Israel…each according to its name, for the twelve tribes.

4Q365 12 iii 13, “And the stones, according to the names of the children of Israel…each according to its name, for the twelve children of Israel.

Lev 26:30, “I will destroy your high places”

4Q365 25 14, “I will make desolate your high places”

Cf. Lev 26:31, “I will make desolate your sanctuaries”

tendency to assume that more or less every change can be attributed to “exegesis.” It should be noted, though, that if the edition were republished today, things might be presented differently: in recent years Tov has changed his mind about the status of the 4QRP texts and now fully endorses the theory that they are expanded copies of the Pentateuch. See, e.g., Tov, “Three Strange Books.” Sidnie Crawford has also moderated her position, stating in a recent article that “I hold the position that their [sc. the 4QRP texts'] status as authoritative Scripture is indeterminate, and therefore a final judgment should be withheld.” See Sidnie White Crawford, “The Use of the Pentateuch in the Temple Scroll and the Damascus Document in the Second Century B.C.E.,” in The Pentateuch as Torah: New Models for Understanding Its Promulgation and Acceptance (eds. Gary N. Knoppers and Bernard M. Levinson; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 301-17, at pp. 302-3. See also Crawford, Rewriting Scripture, 56-57.
And cf. Lev 26:32, “I myself will make desolate the land”

Num 7:79, “His offering was...one basin of silver”

4Q365 29 3, “His offering was...one silver basin”

Cf. Num 7:13 et passim, “His offering was one silver plate”

One change may have been intended as a clarification:

Exod 29:21, “and he and his vestments shall be holy”

4Q365 9b ii 3, “and Aaron and his vestments shall be holy”

In one case, 4Q365 appears to preserve a conflation or “double reading”:

Exod 18:14 MT SP, “And Moses’ father-in-law saw...”

Exod 18:14 G, “And Jethro, seeing...”

4Q365 7 ii 1–2, “And Jethro, Moses’ father-in-law, saw...”

In another case, 4Q365 may preserve an earlier reading that was subsequently incorporated into a double reading in G:

Exod 36:37 MT SP, “he made a screen for the entrance of the tent”

197 On the phenomenon of double readings, see Tov, Textual Criticism, 241-43.
4Q365 12 i 6, “he made a screen for the tent of meeting”

Exod 36:37 G (= 37:5) καὶ ἐποίησαν τὸ κατασκεύασμα τῆς θύρας τῆς σκήνης τοῦ μαρτυρίου, “and they made the curtain of the entrance of the tent of witness”

Finally, one series of alterations may reflect an exegetical “correction”: throughout frag. 12 ii (= Exod 37:29–38:7), 4Q365 reads ויעשו instead of MT’s ויעש. If one goes back to the beginning of the construction report in Exod 36:8, one finds indeed a plural subject: ...ויעשו כל חכמי על.... “And all those wise of heart made....” But this plural is quickly dropped in favor of the singular verb in MT and SP (see already the end of v. 8), and thereafter the verbs are in the singular. An editor seems to have noticed this discrepancy and systematically changed the verbs to bring them into agreement with the original plural subject. (The singular verbs in MT SP may be due to the final summary statement in Exod 38:22, “And Betzalel son of Uri son of Hur, of the tribe of Judah, made everything which YHWH commanded Moses.”) 198

4Q365 presents only one case which I have tentatively classified as a paraphrase. This is frag. 37, the four legible lines of which read as follows: 199

198 See Tov and White, DJD 13:279.

199 This transcription follows DJD 13 apart from line 4. In that line, Tov and Crawford read the last word as ובית. After the ב, the top of which is clear, only small and indistinct traces from the tops of one or two letters remain. There seems to be much too little space for both וב and י; if there are two letters involved they would have to be narrow ones.
Tov and Crawford tentatively identify this fragment as “Deut 2:24 or 36?,” further noting that “The subject matter of this fragment is probably related to Deut 2:24 or 2:36, but it cannot be placed in any particular location.”

It is true that both those verses refer to מלחמה and 2:24 has the word מלחמה, but other aspects of the fragment cast doubt on this identification. First, the verb חנה does not occur in the vicinity of these verses; its only occurrence in Deuteronomy is in 1:33. Second, the person of the verb in its two occurrences is third person plural—not what we would expect from Deuteronomy, since Moses uses the first person throughout his recollection of the wilderness wanderings. The presence of the verb חנה and the third-person voicing points, not to Deuteronomy, but to the parallel narrative in Numbers. Num 21:23 describes Sihon, king of the Amorites, leading את כל עמו, “his entire army,” out against Israel and doing battle with them (וילחם בישראל). Num 21:13 notes that the Israelites camped “on the other side of the Arnon” (בריהם לארמון), and other verses in this section mention stops on the Israelites’ itinerary, though without using the verb יחל (Num 21:16, 19, 20). The only phrase that specifically recalls Deuteronomy 2 as opposed to Numbers 21 is נחל ארון.

Given what appear to be parallels in content but lack of extensive verbal correspondence, I wonder whether frag. 37 represents a paraphrase of material from Numbers 21. Insofar as, in Numbers, the notice about camping at the Arnon precedes

---

200 Tov and White, DJD 13:311.
rather than follows the notice about the battle with Sihon, this paraphrase would have
involved a change in sequence. Insofar as there is at least one phrase unique to
Deuteronomy (ארנן נחל), we might also posit that the paraphrase involved a
harmonization of the Numbers passage to its parallel in Deuteronomy. Unfortunately, the
few words preserved on each line preclude a better understanding of exactly what sorts of
changes the editor made. If this assessment is correct, however, this fragment is
analogous to 4Q158 frag. 14 + 14a, which likewise contains a paraphrase that
incorporates language from a parallel passage.

Turning to rearrangements, I have identified only one clear case, of relatively
limited scope. Frag. 32 1–2 contains the end of the list, by tribe, of the men selected to go
up and spy out the land of Canaan (Num 13:4–15). In 4Q365, however, v. 13, which
names the representative for the tribe of Asher, has been moved to the end of the list, so
that it now occurs between vv. 15 and 16. This different order may simply reflect a
different tradition regarding the order of the tribes. It may also reflect a harmonization to
one of the three places in the Pentateuch where Asher is named last in a list of Jacob’s
sons (Gen 35:23–26; Exod 1:4; Deut 33:20–24), although there are also multiple
instances where Asher is not named last.

4.2.5 Special Cases: The Challenge of Understanding Major Juxtapositions

Two of the most conspicuous changes extant in 4Q365 remain to be discussed, for
the simple reason that it is not clear how they should be classified. Both present a
juxtaposition of materials that are not adjacent in the Pentateuch as known from
elsewhere. In frag. 28, the text of Num 4:47–49 is followed, after an empty line, by Num
7:1. Similarly, frag. 36 presents Num 27:11 followed directly, without so much as a vacat, by Num 36:1–2. The compositional logic of both of these arrangements is clear. The end of Numbers 4 is the end of the census that has occupied the first chapters of the book, and Numbers 7 represents the narrative continuation of that episode, the presentation of gifts to the newly-completed Tabernacle by the tribal leaders who had been responsible for the census. From the perspective of the narrative, the assorted legal materials in chapters 5 and 6 are an irrelevant intrusion. The join of Numbers 27 and 36 has a similar logic: the two passages both deal with the issue of Zelophehad’s daughters and the right of women to inherit property. Chapter 27 represents the original legal pronouncement and chapter 36 its subsequent amendment. From both a legal and a narrative perspective, it is no surprise that an editor would have wanted to put the two passages next to each other.

While the reasoning behind these two moves is easily discerned, their implications are not. The piecemeal preservation of 4Q365 makes it impossible to answer definitively two important questions: first, can we be certain that the pericopes were truly rearranged, as opposed to one of them being retained in its usual location and simply repeated at this new place (thus creating what I have called an addition of material from elsewhere)? Second, what happened to the intervening material? If, for example, Numbers 5–6 were simply omitted from the work altogether, then what we are dealing with is not rearrangement at all, but omission, with the result that the originally separated chapters 4 and 7 now occur in succession.

The first question does not have an answer that can be proven, but one option does appear to be more plausible than the other. Large additions from elsewhere make the
most sense where there is some sort of parallel in another context to the content of the passage that is repeated: the fulfillment of a command; the recollection of an event or speech or dream. From the examples discussed thus far, we saw that the site where the addition is made is usually lacking an explicit reference that an editor feels to be desirable. Thus in 4Q158 frag. 1–2, the text does not simply say that Moses told Aaron everything that YHWH had told him (as in MT SP); it actually repeats YHWH’s words in the new context. Similarly, 4Q364 and SP reflect someone’s discomfort with the fact that Jacob says in Gen 31:10 that he has had a dream, but there is no actual record of the dream—so the dream itself is inserted.

This sort of situation, on the face of it, does not seem to apply to the juxtapositions found in 4Q365. There is no recollection or command or other meta-narrative aspect: it is simply that two parts of the story that belong together are separated by other, unrelated material. This would suggest that we are not dealing with additions from elsewhere. It must be said that this is by no means a conclusive assessment; once again, the state of the texts precludes certainty. One could imagine, for instance, that the Numbers 27 material in frag. 36 is in fact some sort of narrative flashback, introduced by something along the lines of “Now the daughters of Zelophehad had come before Moses…” 201 Addition from elsewhere cannot be ruled out, but the nature of the texts makes it the less likely alternative.

201 Something like this may have happened in another combination of Numbers 27 and 36, in 4QNumb. There, it seems that the editor may have cast material from Numbers 27 as a recollection by the clan leaders who come to speak to Moses in Numbers 36; that is, instead of simply mentioning the legal outcome of the earlier situation (“my lord was commanded by YHWH to give the inheritance of Zelophehad our brother to his daughters,” Num 36:2b MT), the elders according to 4QNumb may have recounted the entire earlier episode of the daughters’ appeal to Moses. (For a full description of the pericope in 4QNumb, see below, nn. 207 and 261.) The situation cannot be exactly the same in 4Q365,
The second question noted above, what happened to the intervening material, is much more vexing. We simply cannot know for certain whether the material was omitted completely or moved to another place in the composition. Previous work on the 4QRP texts has not usually acknowledged this fundamental gap in our information. Tov, for instance, writes in a 1994 article, “4QRP rearranged some of the material, and when doing so it only seemingly omitted material intervening between the two or more pericopes which are now juxtaposed. Hence these are no real omissions.” Tov’s reasoning is linked to his assumption that all five 4QRP manuscripts represent the same composition: in some cases of juxtaposition, some of the intervening material appears in another 4QRP manuscript—for example, parts of Numbers 33 occur in 4Q364 frag. 19. If all the manuscripts reflected the same composition, then the presence of the intervening material in any one of the manuscripts means that it was not actually omitted.

However, the idea that all five 4QRP manuscripts represent the same composition has been criticized, and seems a tenuous basis on which to found other conclusions about the nature of the texts.

Ironically, one of the scholars who is critical of seeing only one composition in the 4QRP manuscripts nonetheless makes a similar assumption: that 4Q365 contains no

---


203 This reasoning seems to lie behind the editors’ statement with regard to the juxtaposition of materials from Leviticus 15 and 19 in 4Q367 frag. 2 (for a discussion of this fragment, see below, section 4.4) that “[t]he material occurring between 15:14–15 and 19:1–4 probably has not been omitted, but perhaps was adduced elsewhere, since Lev 18:25–29 in fact occurs in frg. 22 of 4Q365.” Tov and White, DJD 13:349.
substantial omissions is implied in Michael Segal’s work on the distinction between editions of biblical books and “Rewritten Bible” texts. Segal suggests that only “Rewritten Bible” texts felt free to omit significant amounts of material, while biblical books tended to expand but not to contract. Because he classifies 4Q365 as a copy of the Pentateuch, and not a “Rewritten Bible” composition, Segal seems to assume that it contained no such omissions.204 Contrary to Tov and Segal, Moshe Bernstein has argued that we should not assume that displaced materials such as Numbers 5–6 were moved elsewhere in the scroll, but reckon with the possibility that they were omitted altogether. For Bernstein, the omission of large chunks of legal material would probably constitute evidence that the 4QRP manuscripts are not copies of the Pentateuch.205

This dilemma is frustratingly irresolvable in the absence of more information. Bernstein is right, of course, to caution that we cannot assume that 4Q365 would have found a new home for Numbers 5–6 and 27:12–35:34. Equally, though, we cannot assume the opposite: that the material was omitted. To make matters even more complicated, the impact of a decision either way on the issue of whether 4Q365 could be a copy of the Pentateuch is also unclear. We do not have examples of large sections of material being omitted in the course of transmission of biblical books, it is true. Perhaps this does suggest that, if major amounts of material were omitted, the composition reflected in 4Q365 was intended as something other than a new edition of the Pentateuch. On the other hand, our conception of the transmission of Scripture in the Second Temple

204 See Segal, "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible," 15, 23-24. Similarly, in an earlier work, Segal states, “the scribes responsible for 4Q364–5 have adduced the entire text of the Pentateuch…,” without providing any evidence for this claim. See Segal, "4QReworked Pentateuch," 394.

205 Bernstein, "What Has Happened to the Laws?," 48.
period has been revolutionized by the discovery of the Qumran texts, and in many ways is still in flux. We should not completely close off an option because it seems illogical or inconsistent to us. On this issue, therefore, it seems that we are forced to live with multiple uncertainties.

4.2.6 Summary

In assessing the compositional techniques of 4Q365 in comparison to those of 4Q158 and 4Q364, both differences and similarities emerge. Once again, addition from elsewhere, a particularly common technique in 4Q158, is attested only sporadically and in small quantities. Likely cases of paraphrase are also less common. On the other hand, there is no clear parallel in 4Q364 and only one in 4Q158 (the sequence Decalogue + Deut 5:30) for major juxtapositions (due to rearrangement?) such as those found in 4Q365 frags 28 (Numbers 4 + 7) and 36 (Numbers 27 + 36). It should also be noted that 4Q365 does not seem to be based on a pre-SP version of the Pentateuch: in contrast to 4Q158 and 4Q364, it does not share any major changes characteristic of SP or the pre-SP texts. In fact, in two instances where the text of 4Q365 is preserved and SP diverges substantially from MT, 4Q365 follows MT. This independence is further underscored by a striking similarity: 4QNum\(^b\), surely responding to the same compositional or narratological concerns as 4Q365, also combines Numbers 27 and 36; however, it does so

\(^{206}\) 4Q365 frag. 8 contains Exod 26:34–36 MT (SP and 4QpaleoExod\(^a\) insert Exod 30:1–10 after v. 35); frag. 9 ii contains Exod 29:20–22 MT (SP relocates v. 21 after v. 28).
in a different way. The two texts reflect similar concerns on the part of their editors, but do not reflect an exemplar-copy relationship.

All these points of contact and divergence aside, the great uniqueness of 4Q365 is the amount of additional new material it contains and, in many cases, the parallels between this material and the Temple Scroll. The several columns of 4Q365a are far larger than any other addition attested in the other 4QRP manuscripts, and they along with the addition in frag. 23 give 4Q365 a distinctive focus on the Temple and Temple cult. The overlap with the Temple Scroll also contextualizes both 11QT and 4Q365. Despite unclarities about which text is earlier and who drew upon whom—or whether a common source is at issue—we see that neither text existed in a vacuum, but shaped or was shaped by other texts circulating at the time. For all the uniqueness of 4Q365, however, it should be stressed that its compositional techniques are the same as those found in 4Q158 and 4Q364: the differences are not qualitative but quantitative.

4.3 4Q366

All that remains of 4Q366 is five moderately-sized fragments, but these fragments contain material from Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. As might be expected from its small size, 4Q366 does not preserve the breadth of compositional techniques identified in the other manuscripts. Aside from a few minor alterations and

207 In 4QNum³ᵇ, Num 36:2 and 36:4 appear on either side of a lacuna of 13 lines. Since vv. 2 and 4 are both expanded in this manuscript to make mention of Eleazar the priest, who otherwise appears only in chapter 27, the editor postulates that the lacuna, much too large for the missing text of Num 36:2–4, contained material from chapter 27. As mentioned earlier (n. 201), the addition may have been structured as a recollection by the clan elders of the earlier legal discussion. See below, n. 261, as well as Nathan Jastram, "4QNum³ᵇ," in Qumran Cave 4, VII: Genesis to Numbers (by Eugene Ulrich, et al.; DJD 12; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 205-67, at pp. 260-64; Tov, "Rewritten Bible Compositions," 353.
additions, there are only two major changes, both of which consist of the juxtaposition of originally separate materials.

4.3.1 Minor Additions and Alterations

Since there are so few of these, I will discuss them together. Two of the minor alterations are minor in the extreme, one involving the absence of a copula present in other versions, and the other involving a masculine instead of a feminine possessive suffix. The third and final example is somewhat more interesting.

Exod 22:4 MT

If a man causes a field or vineyard to be grazed, and he sends out his cattle and they graze in another field, (of) the best of his field and the best of his vineyard he shall repay.”

Exod 22:4 SP

“... of the best of his field and the best of his vineyard he shall repay.”

4Q158 10–12

... שלד כותב אשת מבואות אסכול השדה באה... ויתו...

4Q366 1 9–10

... שלד את [פועה ובטשה אחר] אום כל השדה [בשת...]

It seems that 4Q366 represents a version of this law that contained the plus attested in SP (and 4Q158 and G), but shows no sign of discomfort with the ambiguity of

208 4Q366 3 5 reads למנהל נמנהה for MT, SP נמנהה in Num 29:19; and frag. 5 3 has למנה for MT, SP למנה in Deut 14:18 (this despite the apparent femininity of the preceding noun, גזירה.)
The verb בּוּר, in contrast to the moves in both SP and 4Q158 toward the less ambiguous root בּוּר.209 The reading in 4Q366 could have one of two explanations. 4Q366 could represent the original form of the plus, which would then have followed the shorter MT in using בּוּר for the action described in the law, with SP and 4Q158 representing later attempts at greater clarity. On the other hand, SP could represent the original form of the plus, already embedding a move away from בּוּר. If this is the case, then the reading in 4Q366 could have stemmed from an editor who was more concerned about lexical consistency than semantic ambiguity (perhaps he perceived none). While the first option seems simpler and therefore perhaps more likely, there is no good reason to rule out the second option.

There is only one addition of any size in 4Q366:

Lev 25:41  ובש אל משפחותה... “and he shall return to his family…”

4Q366 2 6 ובש ושב אחזתו לשessed “and he shall return] to his possession
and to his family…”

This addition was likely influenced by Lev 25:10, 13, 27, 28, all of which have the formulation ובש אל משפחותה or ובש למשפחותה.210

---

209 See above, pp. 105–6.

210 Tov and White, DJD 13:339.
4.3.2 Rearrangements (?)

As mentioned above, the two major changes extant in 4Q366 both involve juxtaposition of materials that do not occur together in other versions. In frag. 2, Lev 24:20–22 in lines 1–3 is followed by Lev 25:29–43 in lines 4–8. In frag. 4, lines 1–9 contain the conclusion to the Priestly festival calendar in Num 29:32–30:1, while line 10 contains the beginning of Deuteronomy’s law for the festival of Sukkot (Deut 16:13–14).

The logic behind the second juxtaposition is reasonably clear: the end of Numbers 29 and Deut 16:13–14 both contain legislation for Sukkot; thus an editor seems to have grouped these laws together on the basis of their common content—a procedure well known from the Temple Scroll. The first juxtaposition, of Lev 24:20–22 (the laws of talion) with Lev 25:39–43 (slavery and indentured servitude) is less easily explained. Tov and Crawford suggested that the passages were linked because the “sojourner” appeared in each.211 As has been pointed out, this explanation is not compelling. First, the “sojourner” is not the focus or main figure of either law. Second, different Hebrew words are at issue—גר in Lev 24:22, but תושב in Lev 25:40—making a key-word association much less likely.212 However, Tov and Crawford mention without elaboration another possible explanation: “Likewise, note that these two laws are juxtaposed in Exod 21:24–25 and 26–27.”213 On the face of it, this statement does not appear to be true. Exod 21:24–25 does deal with talion, though in the specific case of accidental injury to a pregnant woman (see vv. 22–23). Vv. 26–27, however, deal not with slavery or

211 Tov and White, DJD 13:339.

212 See Segal, "4Reworked Pentateuch," 397; Bernstein, "What Has Happened to the Laws?," 41.

213 Tov and White, DJD 13:339.
manumission per se but with the case where a master beats his slave. Yet it is striking that
the slave law in Leviticus, in emphasizing that an Israelite sold into debt-slavery must be
treated well, commands וְלָא תָּהָרְע בְּמוֹרֵךְ, “you shall not rule over him with harshness”
(25:43), a stipulation that certainly bears a conceptual relationship to the Covenant Code
law on beating slaves. Thus the sequence talion—treatment of slaves original to the
Covenant Code is at least approximately matched by the new sequence in 4Q366.
Perhaps this fragment reflects an editor’s attempt to rearrange some or all of the Holiness
Code’s legislation so that its sequence conforms to that of the Covenant Code.

These two fragments present the same difficulties as the juxtapositions in 4Q365
discussed above: we have no way of knowing for certain what compositional techniques
are operative here. However, several factors support my tentative classification of these
cases as rearrangements. First, as was the case for the examples in 4Q365, these texts are
not the kinds of texts that are most amenable to addition from elsewhere—they do not
contain speech reports, predictions, accounts of the fulfillment of commands, or any
similar “metanarrative” feature. In fact, the repetition of these texts in a new location
would actually detract from the coherence of the text, as it would exacerbate the
redundancy that already characterizes the pentateuchal legal corpus. From the point of
view of textual coherence, these texts do not need to be repeated, as would a prediction or
instruction in need of fulfillment within the narrative. The difficulty with them, from a
hermeneutical perspective, is that they do not occur in logical sequence; that is, all the
laws on a given topic do not occur in the same place. Thus, it seems likely that the textual
strategy would match the problem, and rearrangement is at issue.
4Q366 actually sheds some light on the second problem associated with these types of juxtapositions, namely the question of what happened to the intervening material—moved elsewhere or simply omitted? The case in frag. 2 is not particularly helpful, especially as the reason for the juxtaposition is not obvious. Moshe Bernstein in fact suggests regarding this passage that our time might be better spent considering reasons why the material between Lev 24:22 and 25:39 might have been omitted than trying to determine a link between the passages themselves.\(^{214}\) Be this as it may—there does seem to be some sort of connection between the two passages—, the case in frag. 4 is different. Here the question would have to be what happened to the entire block of material between Num 30:2 and Deut 16:12. And here we have concrete evidence that all this material could not have been omitted, since frag. 5 contains material from Deuteronomy 14. We know, therefore, that at least in one instance at least some of the intervening material was retained. Of course we do not know how much of Numbers 30:2–Deut 16:12 was originally present in the manuscript, nor whether the evidence from 4Q366 should be applied to other mss. But this case does suggest that, when passages were brought together because of similar content, thought was given to the intervening material—it was not simply omitted, at least not in every case.\(^ {215}\)

\(^{214}\) See Bernstein, "What Has Happened to the Laws?," 41.

\(^{215}\) Note that some of the intervening material is also extant in the one case of rearrangement in 4Q158: frag. 6 contains material that would originally have been located between Exod 20:17 (frag. 7 2) and the end of Exod 20:21b (frag. 7 3).
4.3.3 Summary

The poor preservation of 4Q366 makes comparison with other manuscripts difficult. Unsurprisingly, 4Q366 shows the same sorts of minor alterations and additions as were observed in 4Q158, 4Q364, and 4Q365. The technique of juxtaposing materials originally separated from one another is familiar from 4Q365 and, in a different way, from 4Q158. None of the other techniques attested in the other manuscripts are present—there are no cases of addition from elsewhere, omissions, or paraphrases of any size, and no cases of substantial additions of new material. We have no way of knowing whether these techniques were attested in the full manuscript.

4.4 4Q367

The situation for 4Q367 is similar to that of 4Q366, but even less clear. Only three fragments with identifiable text remain, all from Leviticus. Of these, two present us with unfamiliar juxtapositions of material like those found in 4Q366. Other than the juxtapositions, only two unique variants are preserved, both minor alterations: in frag. 18, 4Q367 reads ת衡水 for MT SP (Lev 12:5), and in frag. 14, for MT SP (Lev 12:2), 4Q367 has מawahך (either מawahך or מawahך or מawahך) (Lev 12:2). An explanation for the juxtapositions is an even more vexed issue than in 4Q366. In frag. 2, lines 1–2 contain material from Leviticus 15, either vv. 14–15 or vv. 29–30.

216 Tov and White, DJD 13:348.
Lines 4–14 contain Lev 19:1–15, but without vv. 5–8. That these four verses might be removed—either omitted or relocated elsewhere—makes a certain amount of sense, as the instructions they contain for the sacrifice of well-being intrude upon a series of ethical prescriptions that in large part parallel the Decalogue. Perhaps here we see the reverse end of the process of rearrangement hypothesized for, e.g., 4Q366 frag. 4 above: the “hole” that results when a block of text is removed from one location and put into a new location where it better fits the context. The connection between Leviticus 15 and Leviticus 19, however, is anything but clear. One might make an appeal to a notion of holiness in each text—in Lev 19:2 the Israelites are charged to “be holy, for I am holy,” while in Lev 15:31 the Israelites are warned to purify themselves properly after genital discharges, lest they defile God’s dwelling place among them. Perhaps there is even a sort of theological harmonization at work: does the juxtaposition implicitly create a connection or equivalence between ritual purity and moral/ethical holiness?

This suggestion clearly crosses the line into speculation, but no other compelling explanation has been offered. Even Bernstein’s proposal to look at what was omitted rather than what

217 Tov and Crawford consider 15:14–15 the more likely choice for the material from Leviticus 15 in lines 1–2, since v. 15 represents the end of a section, being followed by a ב. As Bernstein points out, however, 15:29–30 might make more sense. It is not formally marked as the end of a section, but it is the end of the laws on genital discharges. If lines 1–2 represent Lev 15:14–15, then we would have to explain not only why someone has juxtaposed the laws of discharges with the ethical prescriptions of Leviticus 19, but why someone has juxtaposed certain specific laws of discharges with Leviticus 19. See Bernstein, "What Has Happened to the Laws?" 43.

218 This idea is perhaps not so farfetched as it might seem at first. Jonathan Klawans has discussed the distinction between moral and ritual impurity in the Bible, where H tends to be associated with the idea of moral impurity while P tends to focus on ritual impurity. Klawans also shows how the Qumran community seems to have collapsed the distinction between the two categories. See Jonathan Klawans, Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000). 4Q367 does not show evidence of the typical Qumran scribal practice, making it difficult to know whether it or a text like it was ever read or used by the Qumran community, but my (very tentative) suggestion regarding this juxtaposition would fit well in the context of Qumran thought.
was juxtaposed\textsuperscript{219} seems of little help in this case: by what logic would ch. 16 (Yom Kippur), ch. 17 (proper disposal of blood), and ch. 18 (primarily sexual laws) all be omitted? Of course, they could all have been removed to various more appropriate locations, ch. 16 to a section on festivals, ch. 17 to a section on sacrifice, etc. This, too, is no more than speculation.

The situation in frag. 3 is similarly knotty. Lines 3–5 appear to contain Lev 20:13, which prescribes the death penalty for homosexual intercourse, although the MT/SP does not quite fill the available space. Following an interval, lines 6–14 contain Lev 27:30–34 (the last five verses of the book of Leviticus), which mainly deal with the holiness of tithes. Of lines 1–2 only a few letters remain. These letters may well represent material from Leviticus, but it is clear that they do not fit with anything in Leviticus 20 or 27. Thus we have the sequence Unknown + homosexual sex + tithes. I confess that I have no suggestions as to why these two topics might be combined, nor do I find it especially logical to hypothesize that all the diverse intervening material—including the rest of ch. 20, which deals with sexual behavior just as 20:13 does, and ch. 27, which is closely connected topically to vv. 30–34—might have been omitted or moved elsewhere.\textsuperscript{220} Michael Segal suggests that 4Q367 might represent an “excerpted” text of Leviticus, but

\textsuperscript{219} Bernstein, "What Has Happened to the Laws?," 44.

\textsuperscript{220} See, similarly, Bernstein, "What Has Happened to the Laws?," 44. Tov and Crawford suggest that the connection between the two sections is the phrase \(יומתמות\textsuperscript{2}\) (יומתמות), which occurs in Lev 20:13 and in Lev 27:29; see Tov and White, "Reworked Pentateuch," 351. However, this phrase occurs twelve times in Leviticus, including nine times in Leviticus 20 and two in Leviticus 24, making this explanation uncompelling.
this label does not really increase our understanding very much: why would a series of excerpts contain these particular texts?221

To sum up, 4Q367 resembles 4Q366 in that it contains no major changes other than these juxtapositions. Indeed, aside from the two minor alterations in frag. 1, it contains no other unique readings of any kind. Once again poor preservation prevents us from knowing whether other techniques might have been observed had we had the entire text. Poor preservation also precludes judgment regarding the scope of the text. Even 4Q366, which contains just 5 fragments, has text from four of the five books of the Pentateuch, while 4Q367 attests nothing but Leviticus. There is nothing at all to suggest that it ever contained anything besides Leviticus—though of course, as usual, the alternative cannot be ruled out!

4.5 Summary: The Relationships of the 4QRP Manuscripts to One Another

The preceding discussion allows us to see both similarities and differences among the 4QRP manuscripts with regard to their use of various compositional techniques. An overview is provided by the following table:

221 Additionally, Bernstein points out that the term “excerpted” as commonly used in Qumran studies is generally reserved for a different type of text, such as tefillin and various types of apparently liturgical compilations; see Bernstein, "What Has Happened to the Laws?," 44; Emanuel Tov, "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts from Qumran," RQ 64 (1995): 581-600.
### TABLE 4.1

COMPOSITIONAL TECHNIQUES IN THE 4QRP MANUSCRIPTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4Q158</th>
<th>4Q364</th>
<th>4Q365</th>
<th>4Q366</th>
<th>4Q367</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addition (Small)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition (Moderate)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition (Large)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition from Elsewhere (Small)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition from Elsewhere (Moderate)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition from Elsewhere (Large)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Deliberate) Omissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X (two words)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Alterations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrase</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rearrangement/Juxtaposition of Originally Separate Material</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart makes obvious the distinction between 4Q366 and 4Q367, on the one hand, and the rest of the manuscripts on the other. Both of these manuscripts are characterized only by the presentation of material in an otherwise unfamiliar sequence—besides this they contain no significant changes. It is true that the poor preservation of these manuscripts makes the relevance of this observation unclear. And yet, it is striking that despite the small number of fragments—five for 4Q366, three for 4Q367—each preserves two cases of major new juxtaposition, and no other type of significant change.

The chart also shows that basically all the major types of compositional technique are attested in all three of the larger manuscripts, 4Q158, 4Q364, and 4Q365. 4Q364 does
not contain a clear example of rearrangement or even one of the ambiguous cases of juxtaposition, but there are two possible cases of rearrangement, suggesting that we should not make too much of the category’s absence. On the other hand, 4Q364 contains the only clear case of omission that is likely to be intentional, but the small scope and uniqueness of this one case suggests that it was not a major technique for the editors of any of the manuscripts.

Despite the general agreement between these three manuscripts in their means of reworking the Pentateuch, each one possesses unique traits that separate it from the other two. The chart indicates that only 4Q158 makes use of large additions of material from elsewhere. Although 4Q364 and 4Q365 both attest smaller additions of this type, the absence of such additions on a larger scale points to a clear difference in the way this technique is used in 4Q158. 4Q364 and 4Q365 use small-to-moderate additions from elsewhere to harmonize the language of two similar passages: thus, 4Q364 adds a phrase from the law for judges in Deut 16:19 into the nearly-parallel commands that Moses issues to his newly-appointed judges in Deut 1:17 (4Q364 21). Similarly, 4Q365 makes the language of the summary sentence at the end of the Song of the Sea (Exod 15:19) match the language of the parallel account in Exod 14:29 by simply repeating part of that verse in the later setting (4Q365 6b 5). In contrast, 4Q158 uses the technique of addition from elsewhere in a manner much more comparable (but still not identical) to that of the pre-Samaritan texts, as the next chapter will demonstrate. Such addition generally serves to coordinate not language, but events: it functions on the level of narrative. If there is a notice that Moses related to Aaron all the words that God told him, then there should be an account of what Moses said to Aaron that matches the earlier account of what God
said to Moses (4Q158 frag. 1–2). If God commands Moses to tell the Israelites to return
to their tents, then there must be an account of the people obeying Moses and returning to
their tents (4Q158 frag. 7–9). If God predicts that the Israelites will worship him when
they arrive at Mt. Sinai, there should be an explicit recollection of God’s command—and
notice of its fulfillment—at the appropriate point in the narrative. And so on. 4Q158 also
uses the technique in situations that involve looser parallels, to bring into association
events that clearly were related in the redactor’s mind. The primary examples are the
association of Genesis 32 with Exodus 4 (frag. 1–2) and the reference to the covenant
with the patriarchs (Genesis 17, Exodus 6) in the context of the covenant ceremony on
Mt. Sinai (Exodus 24; frag. 4). Thus, in this case the same compositional technique
occurs in three different manuscripts, but 4Q158 uses the technique differently than
4Q364 and 4Q365. This difference also accounts for the difference in size: 4Q158 tends
to be repeating entire speech-acts or events in order to create connections or coordinate
command and fulfillment, while 4Q364 and 4Q365, focused on language, can effect their
harmonizations with only a few words.

If 4Q158 is unique in the use it makes of addition of material from elsewhere,
4Q365 takes a different technique beyond the other manuscripts: the addition of new
material. Substantial amounts of new material are also found in 4Q158 and 4Q364, but
they are far exceeded by the multiple additional columns contained in the 4Q365a
fragments, to say nothing of the sizable additions in 4Q365 frag. 6a, c ii (the “Song of
Miriam”) and frag. 23 (the wood offering). The close parallels with the Temple Scroll
present in some of these additions also mark 4Q365 off from the others in that they
indicate a connection with a specific tradition of thought regarding the Temple and the cult.

In contrast to 4Q158 and 4Q365, 4Q364 emerges as a marginally more conservative reworking of the Pentateuch. It certainly does contain a wide variety of major changes, but attests neither the pronounced interest of 4Q158 in coordinating related passages nor the extensive additions of 4Q365. A picture thus emerges of the three large 4QRP manuscripts as texts that share a set of strategies by which they rework the Pentateuch, but that employ those strategies in different proportions and to different degrees. Tov and Crawford’s initial statement that the manuscripts “share important characteristics” is true, but obscures the differences between them.

Reflecting purely from the perspective of compositional technique on the issue of whether the 4QRP manuscripts should be considered a single composition, the evidence is generally negative. The extensive use of additional material from elsewhere in 4Q158 and the massive additions of new material in 4Q365 suggest that they each stem from an editorial hand (or hands) different from that (or those) responsible for the somewhat more conservative 4Q364. All three of these can be distinguished from 4Q366 and 4Q367, which attest no significant additions or paraphrases of any sort. Of course the lack of physical overlap among the manuscripts makes this conclusion difficult to prove: one might argue that perhaps 4Q158 represents a portion of the text that is particularly concerned with making connections between related texts, or that 4Q364 did in fact also contain the huge temple-related addition of 4Q365 but it simply was not preserved. Yet

---

222 Moshe Bernstein comments, “This manuscript of 4QRP, out of the five given that name, contains probably the least radical manipulation of the non-legal material in the Pentateuch.” See Bernstein, "What Has Happened to the Laws?,” 34.
surely it strains credibility to assert that such additions from elsewhere as are characteristic of 4Q158, occurring six times in fifteen fragments, simply did not occur (or were not preserved) elsewhere in the composition, or that no trace of multiple nonbiblical columns was preserved in 4Q364. Even with the extremely fragmentary 4Q366 and 4Q367, such an appeal to absent material is less than convincing: it seems likely to be significant that a compositional technique—rearrangement or juxtaposition of previously separate material—that occurs only four or five times in the 89 fragments of 4Q158, 4Q364, and 4Q365 + 365a is found four times in the 8 fragments of 4Q366 and 4Q367.223

It is of the nature of the Qumran materials that lacunae preclude firm decisions; on the other hand, it seems imperative to make judgments based on what we can deduce from the extant materials. Until more evidence comes along, we should respect the real differences between the five manuscripts and regard them as related compositions, not copies of the same work.224

This conclusion on the basis of compositional technique is corroborated by other types of evidence. First, it might be mentioned that, while 4Q158 and 4Q364 both appear to have been based upon a pre-Samaritan version of the Pentateuch in that they contain

223 Because of this overlap in compositional technique, 4Q366 and 4Q367 come across as more closely related than any of the other manuscripts. Of course their extremely poor preservation is an issue here, but it would be more plausible in my mind to regard 4Q366 and 4Q367 as possibly having an exemplar-copy relationship than any other constellation of the 4QRP mss. There is, however, no physical evidence for this, and the fact that something is plausible does not mean that it is true.

224 Contrary to the opinion expressed by Sidnie Crawford, this assessment does not become less meaningful if any or all of the 4QRP manuscripts constitute copies of the Pentateuch. If this were the case, the differences in compositional technique would of course not mean that each manuscript contained a different “composition”, as they would all represent versions or editions of the same composition—the Pentateuch. However, evidence for five substantially different editions of the Pentateuch seems in no way less significant than evidence for five different “rewritten Scripture” compositions. See Crawford, "'Rewritten' Bible at Qumran," 6.
multiple major features of that version, 4Q365 seems to have been based upon a different
version. It seems highly unlikely, if not impossible, that such a discrepancy in *Vorlage*
would occur between the different manuscripts if they represented a single reworking of
the Pentateuch. Second, George Brooke has demonstrated that, in the few places where
the same pericope is partially preserved in 4Q158 and in one of the other manuscripts, the
two versions cannot be reconstructed as containing the same text. To extend Brooke’s
argument regarding 4Q158 on the basis of the compositional evidence considered here, it
thus seems most accurate to refer to the five Reworked Pentateuch manuscripts as five
related compositions, 4QRP A–E, rather than five copies of the same composition,
4QRPa–e.

Finally, a few words must be said about the processes by which 4Q364–367 came
into being. At the end of Chapter 2, I observed that there is little reason to think that all
the changes in 4Q158 vis-à-vis known versions would have been made by a single editor.
This chapter has illustrated that, fundamentally, the same holds true for the other 4QRP
manuscripts. Like 4Q158, all demonstrate a general concern for the coherence of the
scriptural text (except perhaps for 4Q367, since the logic behind its changes is not
obvious). This general concern is manifested in changes of various types and sizes.
However, like 4Q158, it is not possible to identify any more specific redactional concerns
in 4Q364–367 that would indicate strongly the presence of a single editor as opposed to a
succession of revisionary scribes.

225 Three of Brooke’s examples come from 4Q364 and one from 4Q366; see Brooke, "4Q158,"
227-34.
This observation is by no means irreconcilable with the point made just above, that each of the 4QRP manuscripts, at least the larger ones, has distinctive characteristics that separate it from the others. Although we do have to postulate, it seems, that each of the manuscripts encountered different types of scribes/editors—4Q158 scribes concerned with coordination of various events; 4Q365 scribes interested in making expansive additions; 4Q364 perhaps slightly more conservative scribes—we still lack compelling evidence that all the major changes or even all the major changes of a particular type would have originated with a single individual. Using 4Q365 as an example for a moment, we could assume that the two major cases of resequencing—the juxtaposition of Numbers 4 and 7, and Numbers 27 and 36—both stemmed from the same editor. Or, we could surmise that one editor made one change, and a subsequent editor copied the move in a different setting to produce the other change. Either or neither of these editors may have been the one responsible for the large amounts of new material found in 4Q365.

Once again, I should stress that I am not interested in taking a position on the question of how many editors or scribes were involved in the development of the 4QRP manuscripts. My concern is rather to point out that we have no evidence for ascribing all the changes—or even just the larger ones—in a particular manuscript to a single individual. It must be kept in mind that the five 4QRP manuscripts may result from long processes of transmission rather than from five creative moments on the part of five individual scribes.
CHAPTER 5:
POINTS OF COMPARISON I:
THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH AND ITS FOREBEARS

One of the most significant results of the discovery of the Qumran scrolls for the field of textual criticism is the recognition that the instances in the Samaritan Pentateuch where the text differs from other known versions are not generally to be attributed to a “sectarian” recension of the Pentateuch by the Samaritans themselves. Rather, the great majority of the changes found in SP occurred at an earlier stage, while only a few were made upon the adoption of this recension by the Samaritans: the addition of a commandment prescribing the construction of an altar upon Mt. Gerizim in both the Exodus and Deuteronomy versions of the Decalogue, and some smaller changes meant to reinforce the idea that God had already singled out that location as the seat of proper worship. In other words, the Samaritans adopted and made minor changes to a recension of the Pentateuch that had already been circulating in early Judaism. This version,

---

known generally as “pre-Samaritan,” is represented at Qumran by 4QpaleoExod$^m$, 4QNum$^b$, and 4QExod-Lev$^f$.\textsuperscript{227}

The following discussion of compositional techniques in this manuscript family will focus for the most part on SP itself. This is because, in the majority of cases, the Qumran pre-Samaritan mss reflect the major details of the text as attested in SP, but in a more fragmentary format. Even with regard to smaller-scale changes, it is easier to understand the precise nature of a change when its complete context is preserved.\textsuperscript{228} However, the pre-SP texts are certainly not identical with SP. For each of the examples that I will discuss below, I will indicate cases where evidence exists that a given change was or was not present in the pre-SP texts. I will also bring some examples of unique readings in the pre-SP texts; that is, alterations not shared by SP itself.

Noting the occasional discrepancies between SP and the pre-Samaritan mss from Qumran raises an issue that will be discussed more fully at the end of this chapter but should be mentioned briefly here at the outset. In examining the SP text tradition as a potential source of analogues to the types of reworking that we have seen in the 4QRP mss, I recognize that there is extensive evidence for its gradual development over time; that is, all its unique features did not come about at the same time. As I will indicate below, most of the largest changes in SP and the pre-SP mss appear to accomplish a very specific goal, and may therefore be the product of a single redactor. On the other hand, some modifications of different types are absent from the pre-SP mss; others occur in a

\textsuperscript{227} Tov, "Rewritten Bible Compositions," 341. For the terminology of “pre-Samaritan”/“pre-SP,” see above, n. 13.

\textsuperscript{228} A point illustrated all too clearly by the guesswork often involved in my analysis of the 4QRP fragments!
pre-SP ms but not in SP; and others yet are also found in LXX (probably indicating that they originated prior to the insertion of the major, characteristic changes in the SP text tradition). 229 Thus I do not treat SP and its forebears as witnesses to the compositional techniques of a single scribe, but rather as witnesses to the types of techniques that were used by a variety of Second Temple scribes in the course of the Pentateuch’s transmission over a period of many years. The relevance of this picture to our understanding of the 4QRP mss will be considered at the end of this chapter.

Discussions of scriptural reworking in SP and its forebears have generally focused on the most noticeable type of change that occurs in it, the frequent insertion of material that occurs elsewhere in the Pentateuch into a new context. 230 However, closer analysis reveals a variety of compositional techniques that provide interesting parallels to what we have observed in the 4QRP manuscripts. For convenience I will follow the categories delineated in the previous chapters. 231

---

229 For an analysis of this issue in the book of Exodus, in light of the pre-Samaritan scroll 4QpaleoExod20, see Sanderson, Exodus Scroll, 191-259.

230 In a way, Sanderson’s monograph on 4QpaleoExod20 (Exodus Scroll) constitutes an exception, since she does consider in detail a whole variety of changes that occur in the various versions of Exodus (see especially her ch. 6). However, the accuracy of the resulting portrayal of the nature of scribal modifications in SP is compromised by the limits she places on her study: she only examines variants for verses of Exodus where 4QpaleoExod20 is extant. Such delimitation of her project is understandable, but the result is that many interesting examples of reworking in the SP tradition, both within Exodus and elsewhere in the Pentateuch, fall outside her purview, which leads in turn to a lopsided characterization of the types of changes that occur in SP.

231 Tov’s overview of alterations in SP and the pre-SP texts in his Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible is organized mainly according to purpose: “Harmonizing Alterations,” “Linguistic Corrections,” “Content Differences,” and “Linguistic Differences” (though the label “Content Differences,” in light of the other category labels, begs the question of what led to the content differences). Besides the major additions from elsewhere, he focuses almost exclusively on very minor examples (one word or less); to my mind he leaves out several interesting, midsized alterations that are significant to an accurate overall characterization of the SP tradition. See Tov, Textual Criticism, 84-100.
5.1 Addition of New Material

It is commonly known that SP does not include major additions of new material of any kind. Even additions of moderate size (several words up to a sentence) are hard to come by, and most of the largest are shared by LXX. However, a few unique additions of some size do occur. One is an explanatory or motive clause appended to the final law of the Covenant Code:

Exod 23:19 MT  אֶלָּא תַבְשֵׁל גּוֹדֵי בָלַח אֵמוֹת, “You shall not boil a kid in its mother’s milk.”

Exod 23:19 SP  לא תבשל גדי בחלב אמה, “You shall not boil a kid in its mother’s milk, for the one who does this is like a zbh škh, and it is ’brh to the God of Jacob.

The precise meaning—indeed, even the proper translation—of this plus has occasioned much debate, but the salient point in this context is that SP contains a relatively extended addition to a pentateuchal legal text.

Two additional pluses address a single issue: the lack of any mention or explanation of the Urim and Thummim before they suddenly appear in Exod 28:30 as items to be fixed upon the breastplate worn by the high priest. Immediately prior to this instruction, SP therefore contains an additional command:

_____________________

232 E.g. the expansions at Gen 43:28; Exod 22:4; Lev 15:3; 17:4.

233 For a new discussion, see David Andrew Teeter, ""You Shall Not Seethe a Kid in Its Mother's Milk": The Text and the Law in Light of Early Witnesses," Textus 24 (forthcoming). Building on a suggestion by Abraham Geiger, Teeter argues that the difficult phrase שׁכַב means refers to the sacrifice of a fetus, which is here regarded as a sin; thus this expansion reflects a legal position shared by 4QMMT, TS, and the Damascus Document against what became the normative rabbinic position, which permitted the slaughter of pregnant animals (the fetus being considered still a part of the mother’s body; see m. Hul. 4:5).
Exod 28:30 MT
“You shall set into the breastplate of justice the Urim and the Thummim...”

Exod 28:30 SP
“You shall make the Urim and the Thummim, and you shall set into the breastplate of justice the Urim and the Thummim.”

Such a command should not be left without a record of its fulfillment, so a corresponding notice appears in SP after Exod 39:21,

“They made the Urim and the Thummim just as YHWH commanded Moses.”

Finally, SP contains a series of pluses in Genesis 11. They all follow the same pattern: “All the days of X were Y years, and he died.” Thus for the first, to Gen 11:11, we have:

Gen 11:11 MT
“And Shem lived five hundred years after he fathered Arpachshad, and he had other sons and daughters.”

234 This plus is not extant in 4QpaleoExod col. 32, although some of the surrounding context is. It appears that the plus would fit well into the available space, and thus probably did occur in the text. The notes in DJD 9 make no mention of the possible variant.

235 The second plus (after 39:21) is partially extant in 4QExod–Lev f 1 ii 5–6. Cross, the editor of that text, suggests that the longer version attested by SP represents the original Hebrew text, “lost by paralepsis (homoioteleuton or homoiarchton) in other traditions”; see Frank Moore Cross, “4QExod-Lev," in Qumran Cave 4, VII: Genesis to Numbers (by Eugene Ulrich, et al.; DJD 12; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 133-44, at p. 139. It strikes me as somewhat implausible that both the command in 28:30 and the execution in 39:21 would have disappeared through scribal errors such that they are not preserved in any other tradition, and more likely that the absence of a note regarding the creation of the Urim and Thummim would have drawn the attention of a later scribe. Rendtorff notes further that the SP plus creates a doubling of the words התמים ואית(userid) in Exod 28:30, a redundancy that would be unlikely if the longer version was original; see Rolf Rendtorff, Leviticus (HKAT; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 2004), 273.
And Shem lived five hundred years after he fathered Arpachshad, and he had other sons and daughters, and all the days of Shem were six hundred years, and he died.

Similar pluses occur after vv. 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, and 25. That these pluses constitute later expansions can be seen from the fact that they, although technically containing new material, are modeled on the genealogy in Genesis 5, which consistently uses this formula. An editor apparently noticed the formal discrepancy between the two lists, which otherwise employ identical formulae, and brought them into alignment.

The previous chapters have shown that additions of similar size occur several times in 4Q158, 4Q364, and 4Q365. Unfortunately, none of these examples provides a precise parallel to either of the first two cases mentioned just above: there is no instance preserved in the 4QRP mss of the addition of a motive clause to a law or command, nor of the insertion of an entire command, with or without the record of its fulfillment. A better parallel exists for the additions to Genesis 11 that conform its formulation to that of Genesis 5: the moderate addition in 4Q364 1 to Gen 25:19, where the plus brings the beginning of the יתכן השם into conformity with the beginning of the יתכן השם in v. 12. In both SP and 4Q364, the actual content of the plus is new, but the formulation derives from an earlier verse or verses. Strikingly, genealogy is at issue in both cases.

236 Insofar as the addition in SP Exod 39:21 is dependent upon the presence of the plus in 28:30, the former case can be understood as an “addition of material from elsewhere,” conceptually similar to the added execution clause in 4Q158 7–9 5. As Rendtorff puts it, “Damit [sc. with the addition to Exod 39:21] zitiert der Samaritanus seinen eigenen Text in Ex 28,30”; Rendtorff, Leviticus, 275. Much more will be said about the use of this compositional technique in SP below.
SP contains many more additions, but these are never more extensive than a few words. Just as was the case for minor additions in the 4QRP mss, these small additions serve a variety of functions. A few examples will serve to illustrate the point.

Several of the minor additions in the 4QRP mss address issues of language, such as the addition of את in 4Q158 7–9 4 and 4Q364 4b,e ii 10, and the insertion of ותיה in 4Q364 1 5. Addition of את in SP is very common (see e.g. Exod 1:18; 2:9, 10, etc.), although on occasion an את present in MT is absent in SP (e.g. Lev 14:47). Addition of את in SP is very common (see e.g. Exod 1:18; 2:9, 10, etc.), although on occasion an את present in MT is absent in SP (e.g. Lev 14:47).

Adjustment of syntax similar to the example in 4Q364 1 5 is evident in SP Exod 5:13, although here its reading is not unique but agrees with LXX:

Exod 5:13 MT: "just as when there was straw"
Exod 5:13 SP: "just as when there was straw given to you"
Exod 5:13 LXX: "just as when the straw was given to you"

Here, the MT’s slightly strange absolute use of the verb היה is addressed through the addition of the passive verb. Interestingly, other cases of clarification by addition in SP also parallel the Greek: I have not found any clear cases of purely clarificatory

\[237\] Of course it is very difficult in these cases to determine which version is more original: some Second Temple period scribes appear to have used את more regularly (see below), but such “updating” might have occurred in the process of copying some pre-MT texts as well as in the copying of texts in the SP text tradition. That is, an ואת present in MT but absent in SP might represent expansion in the MT tradition rather than omission in SP. On the more consistent use of את to mark the accusative in SP Exodus than in MT (and 4QpaleoExod), see Sanderson, Exodus Scroll, 230-31. Kutscher observed the same tendency in 1QIsa over against MT Isaiah, noting that this is one of several “parallel tendencies” in 1QIsa and SP. See Eduard Yechezkel Kutscher, The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa) (STDJ 6; Leiden: Brill, 1974), 412-13.
addition in SP that do not occur in LXX. As mentioned above, such parallels could mean that these changes were made earlier in the textual history of the Pentateuch, or they could have come about independently. Sometimes these clarificatory additions address real ambiguities. For example, at Gen 21:33, the referent of the phrase ובאר אשל אברכהם שבע, “And he planted a tamarisk at Beer Sheva,” is not clear in MT, since the subjects of the previous verb, ישב, are Abimelech and his commander. SP and G preserve a reading where any ambiguity has been removed: ובאר אשל אברכהם שבע, and Abraham planted a tamarisk at Beer Sheva.”238 In other cases, however, there is no formal ambiguity, and the addition simply serves to heighten the clarity or readability of the text.239 For example, in Exod 2:2–3, Moses’ mother is the subject of a series of verbs: והָאָשֶׁה וּתָּרָה וְתָלָד וְתָּרָה...וְתָפָעַל...וַיִּכְלֵה...וַיִּתְקַח וְלֹא, “The woman conceived…and gave birth…and saw…and hid him…and she was no longer able…and she took for him a papyrus chest.” Even though there is no other possible subject for that last phrase, SP and LXX contain the additional clarification שבע, so his mother took for him a papyrus chest.”240

Much more interesting than these language-oriented changes are those that serve some interpretive function. Even additions of just one word can have a significant impact

238 This is one instance of a shared reading where it is probably unwarranted to claim a common source for SP and LXX. It seems very likely that two different copyists would have made the change independently, since the plus is almost necessary for the sense of the passage. Note that the word “Abraham” is also supplied by all the major English translations at this point.

239 This phenomenon was also encountered in the 4QRP mss; see above, p. 165.

240 Clarification, it is true, is not the only possible motive behind this addition. Perhaps an editor inserted “his mother” to call attention to the emotional strain inherent in the act being described: a mother’s separation of herself from her infant child.
upon the way a verse is read. Take for instance the insertion of the lowly word הוהי, “this,” in SP Gen 3:3:

Gen 3:3 MT יָמַר הַגֶּן בָּתֹוךְ אֵשֶׁר הַעֵץ וּמְפַרְיָיו... “but from the fruit of the tree which is in the middle of the garden...”

Gen 3:3 SP יָמַר הַגֶּן בָּתֹוךְ אֵשֶׁר הוהי הַעֵץ וּמְפַרְיָיו... “but from the fruit of this tree, which is in the middle of the garden...”

The plus, small though it may be, transforms our image of the scene. As it stands in MT, no location is given for the conversation between Eve and the serpent. The progression of the narrative in vv. 6–7 certainly implies that Eve is near the tree, since immediately after the serpent stops talking (v. 5) Eve looks at the tree, contemplating it, and then takes its fruit and eats. If the mental image of those who know the story is of Eve and the serpent talking under the tree itself, the plus in SP foregrounds this image, proleptically indicating the scene through Eve’s use of the deictic pronoun.

One finds a similar case of an added detail that reflects an element of the narrative revealed only later in 4Q158 1–2 4. Here, the added verb ויאחזהו, “and he held him fast,” seems to have been inserted by way of explanation of the following phrase,(let me go!”

Occasionally, minor additions in SP have halakhic import. The main example here is the addition of the phrase כל בָּהמָה, “or any (domestic) animal,” to the goring ox laws and other laws involving farm animals in the Covenant Code and in Deuteronomy:

Exod 21:28 MT וְיִגְח בֵּית נֹשֶׁה אֲשֶׁר אֵשֶׁר וַעֲתוֹן אֵשֶׁר אֵשֶׁר... “If an ox gores a man or a woman...
Exod 21:28 SP

Exod 21:28 SP

"If an ox or any other animal strikes a man or a woman…"

This same change occurs in Exod 21:34, 35; 22:3; 23:4; Deut 22:1, 4. The additions indicate that the laws are to be interpreted as applying not simply to the specific animals explicitly mentioned, but to any comparable animal; thus the laws’ applicability is extended. To this example can be compared 4Q158 1–2 13, where the reading "שתי הירך כפות" instead of the otherwise attested "הירך כף" similarly serves a halakhic purpose by stressing that neither sciatic nerve can be consumed. It, too, extends the law’s applicability, from one sciatic nerve to both.

Finally, there are also instances in SP of small additions that seem to serve theological purposes. For example, in four cases during the Balaam narrative of Numbers 22–23, an editor in the SP tradition inserts the word "מלאך" before "יהוה" or "אלהים", in each case transforming the subject of the sentence from "YHWH" or "God" to "the messenger of YHWH/God" (Num 22:20; 23:4, 5, 16). In every case, God is in the process of appearing to Balaam (ב ע in 22:20; קרא in 23:4–5, 16). It appears that an editor felt this was inappropriate and that it was God’s messenger who should encounter humans in this fashion—especially since the "יהוה מלאך" does just that elsewhere in the story (see 22:22–

241 Note that this set of variants appears not to have been present in 4QpaleoExod. The context there is fragmentary, but the scroll does preserve the letters הש for Exod 21:29. This corresponds to the MT reading; SP has תסקל בהמה. See DJD 9:104.

242 The same extension occurs in the Mekhila, which also interprets the goring ox laws as applying to any domestic animal (Mek. Neziqin 10:4–8). On this series of changes in SP, see also Weiss, "נרדפים לשונות חילופה", 160–63.

243 The addition in Num 23:4 is partially extant in 4QNum col. 16, and the other pluses all fit well into the available space; see DJD 12:231, 234.
Although similar theological changes, including some that address representations of God that were considered too anthropomorphic, occur at times in the LXX and the Targumim, there is no parallel in the 4QRP mss. This fact is probably of little significance, however, given the poor preservation of the manuscripts and the relative infrequency of these changes in SP itself.

5.2 Addition of Material from Elsewhere

If the editor or editors responsible for SP could be said to have a favorite compositional technique, this would have to be it. Almost all of the most distinctive and recognizable changes in SP over against earlier versions fall into this category. Yet the preceding chapters on the 4QRP mss have indicated that this technique can be used for a variety of purposes. The most extensive examples of addition of material from elsewhere in SP point to a very specific underlying goal, but examples of small to moderate size seem to reflect a different set of concerns. The wide range of examples in this category in SP helps put in perspective the various uses of this technique in the 4QRP mss (primarily 4Q158).

SP is famous for the insertion into various pericopes, particularly in Exodus and Numbers, of material deriving from related passages. For example, the plague narrative in Exodus is expanded through a regular pattern of changes. The basic principle is to ensure the consistency of the depiction of Moses and Aaron as the mouthpiece by which

God speaks to Pharaoh. To this end, the editor responsible for these changes works to make certain that, if God is depicted as commanding Moses and Aaron to say something to Pharaoh, there is a record of Moses and Aaron actually saying this thing to Pharaoh. The first instance of this change, in Exod 7:14–18, can serve to illustrate the whole group. The episode begins with God commanding Moses to go to meet Pharaoh at the Nile as he is completing his morning bath (7:14–15). God then tells Moses what he should say to Pharaoh (vv. 16–18):

Say to him: “YHWH the God of the Hebrews has sent me to you saying, let my people go, that they might serve me in the wilderness. But see, you have not obeyed so far. Thus says YHWH: By this you shall know that I am YHWH: see, I am striking the waters that are in the Nile with the staff that is in my hand, and they shall be changed into blood. The fish that are in the Nile shall die, and the Nile shall stink, and Egypt will be unable to drink water from the Nile.”

Immediately after this, in v. 19, God speaks to Moses again, this time instructing him to command Aaron to carry out the plague itself (“Say to Aaron: Take your staff and stretch out your hand over the waters of Egypt…”). Verse 20 then records Moses and Aaron’s fulfillment of this command: “And thus Moses and Aaron did, just as YHWH commanded, and he [Aaron] lifted up his staff and struck the water that was in the Nile…” This sequence means there is no record of Moses ever going to Pharaoh and warning him of the impending plague as he was instructed to do in vv. 16–18. This situation is rectified in SP by the following insertion immediately after MT v. 18:

So Moses and Aaron went to Pharaoh and said to him, “YHWH the God of the Hebrews has sent us to you saying, let my people go, that they might serve me in the wilderness. But see, you have not obeyed so far. Thus says YHWH: By this you shall know that I am YHWH: see, I am striking the waters that are in the Nile with the staff that is in my hand, and they shall be changed into blood. The fish
that are in the Nile shall die, and the Nile shall stink, and Egypt will be unable to
drink water from the Nile.”

The words of God’s command are now delivered verbatim. The introductory
narrative, ויולו משה ואהרן אל פרעה ואמרו אליו, corresponds to the main points of the
beginning of God’s command in vv. 15–16: אל פרעה ואמרו אליו.

Precisely the same procedure is followed throughout the plague narrative, with
major blocks of repeated material inserted after Exod 7:29; 8:19; 9:5; 9:19; 11:3 (note in
this last instance the original command is all the way back in Exod 4:22–23!).
Interestingly, the reverse procedure is evident after Exod 10:2. Here, vv. 3–6 depict
Moses and Aaron delivering the warning about the plague of locusts, but, unlike the other
instances, there is no record of God commanding them to say this. So this time the
insertion in SP takes the form of a divine command: ...אמרו אל פרעה, “Say to
Pharaoh…”

Besides the plague narratives, the other “locus classicus” for editorial activity in
SP is the frequent insertion of material from Deuteronomy 1–3 into the parallel pericopes
in Numbers. For example, before the episode of the sending of the spies in Numbers 13,
an editor has inserted the beginning of the passage from Deuteronomy that recalls this
same episode (Deut 1:20–23a). Interestingly, the insertion highlights a tension between
the two passages: according to Deut 1:22, it is the people who come to Moses and request
that the spies be sent: they want to know what they are getting into before entering the
land, and Moses agrees to the plan (v. 23a). Yet in Num 13:1 (i.e., immediately after

245 Most of these insertions are partially extant in 4QpaleoExod⁷⁰, and those that are not extant can
be demonstrated through reconstruction to have been present; see DJD 9:65–70.
Moses’ agreement in the SP version of Numbers), God speaks to Moses and instructs him to select men to go and explore the land. I will return to this issue of tensions between parallel accounts below. For now, it suffices to indicate the extent of these insertions:


These two major loci comprise most, but not all, of the cases in SP of moderate and major addition of material from elsewhere. Mention has already been made of the insertion of material from Deuteronomy 5 and 18 into Exodus 20 (also attested in 4Q158), and of the insertion after Gen 30:36 of a narrative episode based on Jacob’s report of his dream in Gen 31:11–13 (also attested in 4Q364). One could add the insertion of Gen 44:22 after 42:16; the insertion of Deut 1:9–18 after Exod 18:24; the insertion of Deut 9:19 after Exod 32:10; and several others.²⁴⁷ Special mention should be made of the plus based on Exod 39:1 that is inserted after Exod 27:19. The plus has to do with the making of Aaron’s garments and is therefore related to the section that begins in Exod 28:1. Thus the placement of the insertion, separated from Exod 28:1 by two unrelated verses concerning oil for the lamps, appears to be wrong.²⁴⁸ The “wrong placement”

²⁴⁶ Again, most of these additions are either extant (5 cases) or can be reconstructed (4 cases) in 4QNum⁵. In the remaining 5 cases no evidence has been preserved either way. As the editor notes, “there is no reason to suppose their absence.” See DJD 12:215.

²⁴⁷ All of the insertions into Exodus mentioned in this paragraph are attested in 4QpaleoExod⁷.

²⁴⁸ Sanderson describes this insertion as “out of place” and “superfluous,” suggesting that perhaps it was a marginal rubric that was subsequently incorporated into the text at the wrong place; see Sanderson, Exodus Scroll, 209-10. Yet this hypothesis does not account for the close correspondence between the plus and Exod 39:1a. Although the instructions for making the priestly garments in 28:2–4 may seem perfectly complete to us, an editor would have searched in vain for a command that corresponds closely to 39:1a, "From the blue and the purple and the crimson they made finely-worked garments for serving in the sanctuary…just as YHWH commanded Moses." (28:2 instructs נְשַׁיִּית בֵּית שָׁאוֹר לְאָהָרִים אַחֲדוֹת, "You shall make holy garments for Aaron..."
provides an analogue for the joining of the two Sukkot laws in 4Q366 4, where Deut 16:13 is not placed directly after the end of the Sukkot law in Num 29:38, where it would seem most natural, but comes only after the conclusion to the whole priestly festival calendar in Num 30:1.

Although these major changes have typically been described as “harmonizations” (and SP therefore as the “harmonistic text” par excellence)\(^{249}\), this is true only if “harmonization” is understood in a very loose sense. As Michael Segal points out, the insertion of material from Deuteronomy into Numbers does not “harmonize” the parallel texts in the sense of removing contradictions or tensions between them. Even if the material in Deuteronomy now has a precedent in Numbers, the material original to Numbers is still absent from Deuteronomy, despite its alleged recapitulation of the events recorded in Numbers.\(^{250}\) In fact, sometimes the juxtaposition of the two versions actually calls attention to the discrepancies between them, as in the episode of the spies mentioned above.\(^{251}\) The other major set of pluses, in the plague narrative, cannot really be called “harmonizations” either, since they do not serve to make a given text more consistent

---

\(^{249}\) See Tov, "Harmonizations," 13. Tov notes that a similar observation was made already by Gesenius in his 1815 work on SP. On the SP group as “harmonistic” (with the suggestion that the name for this group be changed to “harmonistic texts”), see Esther Eshel, "4QDeut"--A Text That Has Undergone Harmonistic Editing," \textit{HUCA} 62 (1991): 117-54, at pp. 120-21. See also Sanderson, \textit{Exodus Scroll}, 257; Crawford, "Use of the Pentateuch," 304-5.


with another text.\textsuperscript{252} Rather, the two sets of changes reflect equal and opposite aspects of a single concern: not a concern that every set of parallels in the Pentateuch match precisely, but a concern with the internal consistency of the Pentateuch specifically as relates to speech events like commands and recollections.\textsuperscript{253} For the editor responsible for SP, if something is commanded, there should be a record that that command is carried out. Conversely, if someone refers to an earlier event or statement, the reader should be able to find that event or statement described at the proper point in the narrative.\textsuperscript{254}

Even though “harmonization” is not the best term for most of the largest changes in SP, it would be incorrect to assert that the editors responsible for the unique shape of SP were never interested in harmonization of one passage to another. Some of these harmonizations involve alterations of substantial size: rearrangement or a compositional technique that I call “replacement with material from elsewhere”; I will discuss these examples below. Additions can also serve the purpose of harmonization, as in the

\textsuperscript{252} Although in an earlier article Tov made broad use of the term “harmonization” to describe the editorial activities of SP, he cautions against the notion of the SP group as “harmonistic texts” (Eshel’s term) in a 1998 article. (For the earlier view, see Tov, “Harmonizations.”) In the later piece, he suggests that the changes characteristic of SP should be “conceived of as exponents of content editing on the basis of parallel stories”; see Tov, "Rewritten Bible Compositions," 340. Tov does not define the term “content editing”—in the context of his article it appears to refer specifically to the adjustment of event to recollection or command to fulfillment.

\textsuperscript{253} The particular concern with speech evident in the pluses unique to the SP tradition is noted by Tigay, although he understands this concern in terms of harmonization: “The main task of the redactor in these pericopes was to reconcile dissimilar accounts of the same events.” See Jeffrey H. Tigay, "Conflation as a Redactional Technique," in Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism (ed. Jeffrey H. Tigay; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), 53-96, at p. 76.

\textsuperscript{254} Segal, drawing on Tov’s language, refers to this concern as “a formal conception of the pentateuchal text”/ the “formalistic understanding of the work of the scribe”; see Segal, "Text of the Hebrew Bible," 16-17; Tov, "Rewritten Bible Compositions," 341. Something about the term “formalistic” strikes me as somewhat trivializing, and I am not sure it is particularly descriptive. The “formalism” exhibited in these changes arises from a profound conviction that Torah is perfect and all-encompassing, and thus is not simply some mechanical scribal procedure. As Samely notes in his treatment of the pentateuchal Targumim, the gaps and inconsistencies that might reasonably be expected in other literature were denied in the case of the Pentateuch. See Samely, Interpretation of Speech, 118-19.
example above where additional summary clauses were added to the genealogical information in Genesis 11 to conform its formulation to that of Genesis 5. One major harmonization involves two instances of addition of material from elsewhere: treating the passage in which the Israelites seek to pass through Edom, an editor, in line with the custom evident in 4QNumb and SP, inserts Deut 2:2–6 before Num 20:14. In most cases, this is as far as SP goes. But in this instance the same editor or a later one also makes the corresponding move of inserting Num 20:14a, 17–18 after Deut 2:7. While the discrepancies are not completely resolved, now the basic elements of both versions of the story appear in both locations.255

The most frequent type of true harmonization in SP occurs on a much smaller scale. It generally involves harmonization, not of entire accounts of events, but of language and formulation in related verses. Even these small changes serve to increase the Torah’s inner consistency, as would befite its divine status in the eyes of the scribe responsible for the changes.256 Furthermore, to return to the compositional technique being discussed in this section, it is very often accomplished by small additions of

255 In the earlier version preserved in MT, Deuteronomy implies that the Israelites were able to pass through Edom, whereas Numbers indicates that the king of Edom refused the Israelites’ request for passage, forcing them to go around Edom by another route. The combination of the two passages, in which the Deuteronomy version comes first, resolves the conflict by implying that God first instructs the people (through Moses) to pass through Edom without disturbance, and then Moses seeks permission from the king to pass through and is rebuffed. Vestiges of Deuteronomy’s original version remain, however, in Deut 2:29, which indicates that Edom did in fact let Israel pass through. See Segal, "Text of the Hebrew Bible," 13.

256 I have argued elsewhere that TS made minor changes in language to its pentateuchal source in order to give the text an impression of greater consistency and thus to bolster the author’s claim that TS constitutes divine revelation; see Molly M. Zahn, "New Voices, Ancient Words: The Temple Scroll's Reuse of the Bible," in Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel (ed. John Day; Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 422; London: T & T Clark, 2005), 435-58, at pp. 442-46.
material from elsewhere. The use of this technique for this purpose is by now familiar
from 4Q364 and 4Q365 as well.

Such additions often involve the adaptation of a given verse or phrase to another
in the same context, as in 4Q365 24 4, where the shorter reading שופר attested in MT Lev
25:9b becomes שוער תורעה under the influence of the first half of the verse. In SP, one
could cite Exod 8:5, where the plus is taken from just two verses later:

Exod 8:5 MT 

לְחֵכְרֵי הַצְּפָרְדְעֵי מִמְּךָ מִבִּהְכֵּלָךְ וְיְבִאְר חַטָּאְרָה

“...to remove the frogs from you and from your house; only in the Nile will they remain.”

Exod 8:5 SP

לְחֵכְרֵי הַצְּפָרְדְעֵי מִמְּךָ מִבִּהְכֵּלָךְ יִבִּיאֵר חַטָּאְרָה

“...to remove the frogs from you and from your house and from your servants and from your people; only in the Nile will they remain.”

Cf. Exod 8:7 MT

וְשָׁרַה נִבְרֵי מִמְּךָ מִבִּהְכֵּלָךְ מִשְׁכְּבֵדֵךְ וּמֶעֶבֶדְךָ וְיִבְרֵי מִבִּיתְךָ מִמְּךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל

“And the frogs will depart from you and from your house and from your servants and from your people; only in the Nile will they remain.”

Another example is found in Deut 2:12, which describes Edom’s conquest of the
Horim. Here, the addition of two words, along with a very minor alteration, makes the
middle of the verse exactly parallel to the description of the conquest of the Rephaim by
the Ammonites in Deut 2:21b:

Deut 2:12 MT

וְיִשָּׁרֵדְנָה מִמְּךָ מִבִּהְכֵּלָךְ מַעֲמַכְּךָ וְיִשְׁכְּבֵּן מִבְּנֵי חַתָּה וְיִשָּׁרֵדְנָה

“...to remove the frogs from you and from your house; only in the Nile will they remain.”

Deut 2:12 SP

וְיִשָּׁרֵדְנָה מִמְּךָ מִבִּמְּכָר יִשָּׁרֵדְנָה מַעֲמַכְּךָ וּיִשָּׁרֵדְנָה

“...to remove the frogs from you and from your house and from your servants and from your people; only in the Nile will they remain.”

Cf. Deut 2:21b MT

וְיִשָּׁרֵדְנָה מִמְּךָ מִבִּמְּכָר יִשָּׁרֵדְנָה מַעֲמַכְּךָ וּיִשָּׁרֵדְנָה

“...to remove the frogs from you and from your house; only in the Nile will they remain.”
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Cf. Deut 2:21b MT, “and YHWH wiped them out of their way and they disinherit them and settled in their place.”

Mention should also be made of some additions of this type found in the pre-SP texts but not in SP, for instance the following case in 4QNum:

Num 20:20 MT, SP: "לָא תַעֲבֵר, ‘you shall not pass through!’"

Num 20:20 4QNum: "לָא תַעֲבֵר בַּיָּמִים הָאָחָיִם אֹתִי לְכַלְכַל בַּחֲרִי בַּיָּמִים לָא תַעֲבֵר, ‘you shall not pass through me, lest I come out against you with the sword!’" 257

Cf. Num 20:18 MT, SP: "לָא תַעֲבֵר בַּיָּמִים הָאָחָיִם ‘you shall not pass through me, lest I come out against you with the sword!”

Another setting for small additions from elsewhere is verses that have a topical parallel in a more distant verse, as when 4Q364 inserts a phrase from Deuteronomy’s law of judges (לָא תַעֲבֵר בַּיָּמִים; Deut 16:19) into Moses’ instructions to the newly-appointed judges in Deut 1:17 (4Q364 21 2); or when 4Q365 adds a clause to Exod 15:19b so that it matches Exod 14:29 (4Q365 6b 5). Several comparable examples can be found in SP, one of which occurs in the context of the laws on Passover and Unleavened Bread:

Exod 12:25 MT: "ועשה את העבדה את החודש, ‘and you shall observe this service’"

Exod 12:25 SP: "ועשה את העבדה את החודש להוה ‘and you shall observe this service in this month’"

257 Transcription follows DJD 12:226. For similar moves in 4QNum, compare its treatment of Num 22:19 (addition of material from 22:8) and Num 24:1 (addition of material from 23:23). Minor examples of this same technique also occur in 4QEx-Lev.
Another example increases the linguistic connections between two deuteronomistic laws dealing with a husband’s dissatisfaction with his wife:

Deut 24:1 MT “If a man takes a woman and espouses her, and if it be the case that she not please him…”

Deut 24:1 SP “If a man takes a woman and goes in to her and espouses her, and if it be the case that she not please him…”

Cf. Deut 22:13 MT “If a man takes a woman and goes in to her and hates her…”

One final example in SP of a small addition of material from elsewhere deserves comment because it appears to go beyond simply coordinating language in a particular context or in parallel verses. Instead, it seems to strengthen a conceptual link between two similar events that are nonetheless not directly related.

Gen 12:16 MT “It went well for Abram because of her [= Sarah], and he had sheep and cattle…”

Gen 12:16 SP “It went well for Abram because of her [= Sarah], and he had sheep and cattle, a great deal of livestock…”

The added phrase, מָכָה בָּכִּר, occurs only one other time in the Hebrew Bible, in Exod 12:38, describing the “sheep and cattle, a great deal of livestock” that the Israelites took with them out of Egypt. Given that Abram himself is in Egypt, about to be expelled by Pharaoh and to leave with all his possessions, it seems that this parallel cannot be coincidental. An editor, observing the parallel between the patriarch’s sojourn...
in and expulsion from Egypt and the sojourn and expulsion of the Israelites four hundred years later, made this parallel more explicit by importing language from the later event into the description of the earlier event.258

This move seems less comparable to the small additions from elsewhere found in SP and the 4QRP mss, or to the larger additions from elsewhere in SP, than to some of the large additions from elsewhere that occur in 4Q158. There, too, we saw changes that served to bring two (or more) similar but distinct events into closer coordination: the insertion of material from Genesis 17 and Exodus 6 into the description of the covenant ceremony in Exodus 24, for instance (frag. 4), emphasizes that the various instances of God’s covenant-making with the Israelites and their forebears are not disconnected events but stand in relationship to one another as attestations of the same fundamental relationship. I also suggested that a similar principle is at work in the apparent association of Jacob’s wrestling match (Gen 32:25–33) with the “bridegroom of blood” episode (Exod 4:24–26) in frag. 1–2. The two events are regarded as analogous rather than identical. Such attempts to stress the connections between independent events are reminiscent—and likely to be precursors—of similar moves familiar from rabbinic literature, especially Targum and Midrash.259

258 For features of Gen 12:10–20 as deliberate allusions to the exodus narrative, see Michael A. Fishbane, Text and Texture: Close Readings of Selected Biblical Texts (New York: Schocken, 1979), 76.

259 As Hirshman puts it, “A great deal of midrash is devoted to a persistent interlacing of various parts of Scripture, relating them intertextually to one another”; Marc Hirshman, "Aggadic Midrash," in The Literature of the Sages: Second Part (eds. Shmuel Safrai, et al.; CRINT II.3a; Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, 2006), 107-32, at pp. 127-28. See especially Samely, Interpretation of Speech, 65-67; Alexander Samely, Forms of Rabbinic Literature and Thought (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 182-84. Also noteworthy in this connection is the phenomenon whereby Second Temple compositions reused motifs or details of pentateuchal narrative even though they tell a totally different story, e.g. the use of elements of the Joseph cycle in Daniel, or the use of elements from the life of Abraham in Tobit. For Daniel, see John J.
In their similarity to this one small addition in SP Gen 12:16, these two examples from 4Q158 indicate how different they are from the larger additions of material from elsewhere that are characteristic of SP. The question becomes whether the 4QRP texts offer any sort of closer parallel to the specific way in which major additions from elsewhere are used in SP. As chapter 4 indicates, the discussion in this regard must in fact be limited to 4Q158, since the other 4QRP mss do not preserve any unique examples of moderate or large additions of material from elsewhere. In 4Q158, on the other hand, this technique was employed fairly frequently. While we have seen that on two occasions the editor of 4Q158 used the technique for purposes quite different from what we find in SP, the other instances of this technique in 4Q158 are closer to SP, some more than others.

The case in 4Q158 1–2 16 shows a concern with speech and speech reports similar to what we find in SP: the MT phrase ... (Moses told Aaron all YHWH’s words...”; Exod 4:28) is complemented by the direct-speech record of what Moses said to Aaron, ... (YHWH to me, saying, when you lead out...”). Two differences should be noted, however. First, SP is generally concerned to rectify situations where either a) there is no record of speech at all where it would have been expected, or b) the details of a person’s recollection do not match the details of the event or speech that person purports to be recounting. Insofar as Moses’ speech is reported and the report, albeit an indirect summary, is a fair representation of God’s earlier words to Moses, this case presumably did not disturb the

editors of SP. There is no case in SP that I am aware of where an indirect reference to a speech event ("Moses told") is supplemented by a "transcript" of that speech event in direct speech. Second, if line 17 in frag. 1–2 continues Moses’ speech to Aaron, then this speech contained more than simply a recapitulation of earlier material, since that line does not have a clear pentateuchal source. Thus, while the same concern with reporting speech seems to be evident in 4Q158 as in SP, the editor of 4Q158 is willing to intervene in a situation where there are not glaring difficulties in the text, and to intervene in a freer way.

A similar mix of shared interest but different approach can be seen in 4Q158 4 2, where Exod 3:12 ("when you lead the people out from Egypt, you shall worship God upon this mountain") is cited in the context of the covenant ceremony of Exod 24:1–8. I suggested earlier that the point of this addition is to stress that the command/prediction given Moses by God in Exodus 3 has now come to fruition as the Israelites perform a

\[\text{260} \text{ In one sense, it is obvious that this pericope did not disturb editors of texts in the SP tradition, since they did not make any major changes to it. However, I do not wish to imply that these editors were completely consistent or that we fully understand their "systems."} \]

\[\text{261} \text{ It should be noted that a close parallel to this example from 4Q158 has been hypothesized by N. Jastram in his edition of 4QNum}^\text{v} \text{ (DJD 12). He argues, soundly, that Num 27:2–11 has been inserted in that manuscript in between Num 36:2 and 3 (between 36:2, extant at the end of col. 31, and 36:4, extant at the beginning of col. 32, 13 lines are missing). He reconstructs the insertion as the recollection of the earlier event by the clan leaders: "At that time the daughters of Zelophehad stood before you [= Moses] and Eliezer the priest..." (see DJD 12:260–64). In the terminology developed here, this insertion would be an addition from elsewhere, since the reference to the past event implies that it has already been narrated earlier. Supporting evidence for this suggestion is the preservation of the beginning of 36:2: presuming the end of the verse was also present, then the leaders make mention of the earlier decision: "and my lord was commanded by YHWH to give the inheritance of Zelophehad our brother to his daughters." Since the leaders are already speaking and have mentioned the earlier decision, the only logical way to account for the presence of the material from ch. 27 is as a "flashback" or recollection spoken by the leaders. This is in contrast to the combination of these two chapters in 4Q365 frag. 36, where they are simply juxtaposed, one after another, making a rearrangement somewhat more likely than an addition of material from elsewhere. In any case, if Jastram is correct, then we would have in 4QNum\text{v} a case where, even though the earlier interaction is referred to indirectly in the original ("my lord was commanded..."), an editor has added a complete "transcript," similar to what we find in 4Q158 1–2 16.} \]
sacrificial service at the base of Mt. Sinai. The concern with coordinating command and fulfillment here is shared with SP, but there is a striking difference: in SP, intervention occurs only in places where there is no mention at all that a command was fulfilled. In this case, Exod 24:3–8 leaves no doubt that Moses and the Israelites did worship God on the mountain, just as God said they would. The insertion in 4Q158 does not supply a missing fulfillment, but reminds the reader/hearer that this action fulfills God’s earlier statement. It makes obvious and explicit a connection that previously would have to have been inferred by the text’s audience. As in the previous example, 4Q158 shares with SP the use of additions from elsewhere to address a particular type of concern (here: coordination of command with fulfillment), but the precise nature of the textual and hermeneutical issues involved differs.

A case containing a more direct parallel to SP’s use of this technique occurs in 4Q158 frag. 7, where the command to Moses לָהַמע אֶמֶרְךָ לָהַמָּה לִאַחֲלוֹתֵךְ, יַעֲשׂוּוּ הָעָם אֶלֶּה רַעֲשׂיָא לַאֲחָלוֹתֵךְ, “Go, say to them: return to your tents,” (line 3) is matched in line 5 by an indication of the fulfillment of Moses’ command: רַעֲשׂוּוּ הָעָם אֶלֶּה, “and each of the people returned to their tents.” Technically, we are missing a step here: at some point, Moses should fulfil the command God gave him to order the people to return (אמרו לָהַמע, “say to them:”). In fact, there is probably room for some version of this at the end of line 4. In any case, though, this example constitutes quite a close parallel to SP’s concern that every command be matched by a notice that that command was fulfilled. 262

262 For further analysis of this addition of material from elsewhere in 4Q158 7–9 5, see above, pp. 88–90.
Another possible analogy to the coordination of command and fulfillment in SP is the insertion in 4Q158 1–2 12 of a (presumably) divine command not to eat the two sciatic nerves, based on the wording of Gen 32:33. In MT, the reason why Israelites do not eat the sciatic nerve (על 컷 לא ישאלו) is because Jacob’s sciatic nerve was injured during his wrestling match (מכ גע בכף רד יעמך...). No other reason is given, suggesting that the practice was understood as some sort of folk custom as opposed to mandatory law. Assuming that we are to understand the added command in 4Q158 as spoken by God, then we can conclude that the author of 4Q158, in contrast, understood this practice to have the status of divine law. But this text-external, halakhic opinion may have led to a textual judgment that is not far at all from what we find in SP. If whoever was responsible for this change in 4Q158 believed (for whatever reason) that the practice of avoiding the sciatic nerve was divinely prescribed—perhaps in his mind no practice incumbent upon Israelites from Jacob’s time to the present day could be anything but divinely prescribed—then the notice על 컷 לא ישאלו בין ישראל את נד 홋שה אשר על 컷, “Therefore, even today, the children of Israel do not eat the tendon of the sciatic nerve which is upon the hip socket” (Gen 32:33), is essentially a notice of fulfillment without its corresponding command. Understood in this way, the situation is precisely analogous to Exod 10:3–6, where Moses and Aaron, by delivering a warning to Pharaoh, are understood by an SP editor as fulfilling a command that is missing from the text. Just as the command, retroverted from the fulfillment, is inserted in SP immediately

Another possibility is that the author viewed the prohibition of the sciatic nerve as part of traditional practice—since the rabbis knew of this prohibition it may have been current earlier as well. Perhaps the motivating factor was the desire to root traditional practice in divine revelation, similar to the claim to Sinaitic authority for the whole of Oral Torah found in tractate Avot of the Mishnah.
before the account of the fulfillment, so in this case 4Q158 inserts immediately before the fulfillment the command that the editor perceived as missing.

To summarize this section on addition of material from elsewhere in SP: the smaller instances of this technique, with the exception of the expansion in Gen 12:16, tend to “harmonize” different verses to one another in the sense of increasing their similarity to one another, usually on the level of formulation, without a great deal of implications for the meaning of the text. In this way SP provides a very close parallel to the 4QRP mss, where small additions from elsewhere function in much the same way. For the additions of larger size, the parallels are less exact, though perhaps the very fact that SP uses this technique so frequently is significant, given that it is prominent in only one of the three major 4QRP mss. In general terms there is substantial overlap in the types of situations in which SP and 4Q158 employ this technique (reports of earlier speech, commands and their fulfillment), and one or two instances in 4Q158 resemble SP strongly.\footnote{Even more generally speaking, David Carr observes (on the basis of 4QRP, SP, and TS) that later reworkings of the biblical text tend to show particular interest in direct speech in general and direct divine speech in particular, and that larger interventions tend to cluster around speech; Carr, "Direction of Dependence," 124. The investigation here supports Carr's observation but also provides a more nuanced distinction between particular types of speech and between particular techniques by which they are reworked.} However, others treat shared concerns without the distinctive principles evidenced by SP: attention is paid to a command and its fulfillment, but it is a case where the fulfillment is already present and needs merely to be highlighted (the notice about worship on Sinai in 4Q158 4 3); or a speech report is made to reflect the exact words of that speech, but the indirect version preserved in MT did not contain any discrepancies.
with the original speech (Moses’ report to Aaron in 4Q158 1–2 16). Finally, two instances go beyond the concern with texts that naturally correspond (a command and its fulfillment, an event and its recollection) to link similar but independent events. An addition of material from elsewhere that seems to serve this purpose does occur once in SP (addition to Gen 12:16), but on the very small scale of an addition of only three words. It constitutes the exception that proves that, normally, addition from elsewhere in SP and related texts functions in a very different way.

5.3 Omissions

Aside from the thorny question of whether pentateuchal material was omitted from any of the 4QRP mss in the course of creating the unique sequences attested there (see section 4.2.5 above), there is only one credible example of deliberate omission in any of the 4QRP mss (the deletion of הבית הנה from Deut 10:1 in 4Q364b, e ii 3). In this regard SP furnishes a fairly close parallel in that instances of omission are rare. One of moderate size does occur in Deut 1:39:

Deut 1:39 MT  הבניכם אשיר לא ידעום חמד ונשי חמה יבא יבאו שמה… “And your children, who now do not know good and evil, they will enter it…”

Deut 1:39 SP  הבניכם יבא יבאו שמה… “And your children, they will enter it…”

265 Note again the reconstructed addition in 4QNumb after Num 36:2 (see nn. 207, 261 above). If Jastrom’s analysis is correct, then the editor of 4QNumb, like the editor of 4Q158, used the technique of adding material from elsewhere in situations where the editor of SP felt no need to intervene.
The omission of “knowing good and evil” may, as Raphael Weiss suggests, be due to an interpretation of the phrase as having sexual connotations.\(^{266}\) Besides this example, and aside from one omission that belongs to the specifically Samaritan revision of SP,\(^{267}\) I am aware of only one minor omission that is clearly deliberate. In Exod 21:35, the word הָעִוף, “the ox,” in the phrase יִפְקְדוּ הָעִוף וָלָקַחְוּ, “they shall sell the living ox,” has been excised. This is in keeping with the larger series of changes that SP makes to this portion of the Covenant Code: since the offending animal in the protasis of the verse is no longer an ox but any domestic animal (בְּהַמַּת כָּל אוֹאָו שָׁוָא), that animal cannot be referred to as simply an ox later in the verse. Since the clause יִפְקְדוּ הָעִוף, “they shall sell the living one,” reads smoothly and conforms to the mention of בְּהַמַּת, “the dead one,” at the end of the verse, the editor opted simply to omit the word שָׁוָא.

\(^{266}\) Weiss, “נרדפים לשונות חילופי,” 158.

\(^{267}\) The omission of the word כל, “every,” in the Covenant Code’s altar law (Exod 20:24) makes the sentence read בְּכָל בֵּית אָבְרָהָם אֲשֶׁר שָׁמְעִית, “in the place where I have caused my name to be remembered,” and thus supports the sectarian claim that Mt. Gerizim rather than Mt. Zion was chosen by God as his official site of worship. The past-tense verb is also a sectarian change (MT = אָפָרָם), making the text refer back to the sectarian tenth commandment in which God commands the construction of an altar at Mt. Gerizim. The unusual orthography should probably be construed as an ‘Aphel perfect, though this would not be a normal form for the Hebrew of the Samaritan Pentateuch. See Bernard M. Levinson, "Is the Covenant Code an Exilic Composition? A Response to John Van Seters," in In Search of Pre-exilic Israel (ed. John Day; London: Continuum, 2004), 272-325, at p. 307; Abraham Tal, "The Samaritan Targum of the Pentateuch," in Mikra (ed. Martin Jan Mulder; CRINT II.1; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 189-216, at pp. 212-13.
5.4 Minor Alterations

The numerous small changes that are found in SP serve a variety of functions. In several of these functions they constitute parallels to similar changes in the 4QRP mss, while some others go beyond what is extant in 4QRP.

Minor alterations addressing perceived infelicities of language or clarifying ambiguities are present in good numbers in both groups of texts. For example, in Exod 4:29, where MT attests the reading אָהָרָן מָשָּה וְיָלְךָ ... in SP the grammar is normalized to read אָהָרָן מָשָּה וְיָלְכוּ. The same move is made on a more extensive scale in 4Q365 12 ii (Exod 37:29–38:7), where the verb וַיִּשָּׁע (MT SP) is regularly changed to וַיִּשָּׁו in light of the plural subject back at the beginning of the building report in Exod 36:8. The clearest example of clarificatory alteration in SP occurs in Gen 14:19, where the ambiguous וַיִּבְרָהוּ, “he blessed him,” of MT, in which the identity of the subject is not clear, is changed to וַיִּבְרָהוּ אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֲבָרְם, “he (Melchizedek) blessed Abram.”268 The reading אָהָרָן in 4Q365 9b ii 3 instead of הוא as in MT functions similarly, although in this case there is no real unclarity as to the referent of the pronoun הוא. An attempt to head off a more serious potential ambiguity occurs in 4Q158 10–12 6 with the change in Exod 22:4 from וַיְבֹרֶה, which in unpointed Hebrew could mean “burn” or “graze,” to וַיְבֹרֶה, which in the context can only mean “graze.”

Another use to which minor alterations are frequently put in SP is harmonization. As was the case with small, harmonistic additions from elsewhere, the change sometimes brings a passage into closer conformity with another passage in the same textual unit, and

268 This change is also attested in LXX.
sometimes harmonizes parallel verses that are at some distance from one another.\textsuperscript{269}

Although both categories appear in SP, only the former is extant in the 4QRP mss, specifically in 4Q365. For example, MT Exod 39:14 refers at first to the twelve \textit{sons} of Israel (whose names are inscribed on the precious stones in the high priest’s breastplate), but the end of the verse indicates that the stones are inscribed with the names of the twelve \textit{tribes} of Israel (לשתים עשר שבעה). Presumably out of a desire to level the formulation of the verse, the editor of 4Q365 changed בנים ישראל שבעה to בנים ישראל, “sons of Israel.”

Elsewhere, at 4Q365 25 14, the editor replaced והשםתי in Lev 26:30 with והשמותי, apparently under the influence of the use of the latter twice in the following verses. For SP, we can observe a similar minor change in Exod 19:12:

\begin{verbatim}
Exod 19:12 MT: "Set bounds for the people all around"
Exod 19:12 SP: "Set bounds for the mountain all around"
Cf. Exod 19:23b: "for you yourself warned us, saying: Set bounds for the mountain and regard it as holy."
\end{verbatim}

Here, however, it is not simply concern for lexical correspondence generally speaking that seems to prompt the change. Rather, it is SP’s familiar concern with the recollection of speech: according to MT, Moses recalls God prescribing the setting of bounds around

\footnote{
Tov suggests that harmonizations be classified according to whether they occur “within the same context,” “within the same book,” or “between different books” (along with other criteria); Tov, "Harmonizations," 5. Formally there seems to be little difference between a change intended to harmonize to a parallel that occurs in the same book (but outside the immediate context) and one harmonizing to a parallel in another book. Raphael Weiss also distinguishes between parallels in the same book and those across books, but subsumes both these categories under the larger rubric of harmonization to a parallel verse, as opposed to harmonization to a verse in the immediate context. See Weiss, “יהלומי לשון טובafia,” 137.}
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the mountain, whereas God’s actual words prescribed bounds for the people. Once again, the change makes original speech and later recollection match.270

SP also contains, as mentioned, a number of minor alterations that harmonize a particular verse to a parallel some distance away. Interestingly, there is a cluster of these sorts of changes in the pentateuchal laws for Pesach and Mazzot. In one instance, the motive clause of the law concerning Unleavened Bread in Exod 34:18 is harmonized to that of the parallel law in the Covenant Code:

Exod 34:18 MT  ואהיה מצות תשמח...למוצע חודש האבך כ בחדש האבך ייצא, “You shall observe the festival of unleavened bread...at the appointed time in the month of Abib, for in the month of Abib you came out from Egypt.”

Exod 34:18 SP  ואתיה מצות תשמח...למוצע חודש האבך כ בחדש האבך, “You shall observe the festival of unleavened bread...at the appointed time in the month of Abib, for in it you came out from Egypt.”271

Cf. Exod 23:15 MT  ואתיה מצות תשמח...למוצע חודש האבך ייצא, “You shall observe the festival of unleavened bread...at the

270 I have not found any clear cases in SP of harmonizations of language through minor alterations that do not reflect such a specific concern but seem simply intended to bring similar verses in the same context into lexical conformity, such as occur with minor additions from elsewhere. There is a possible instance in Lev 26:34b and 43. Both of these verses refer to the land “repaying” or “having restored” its Sabbaths (HAL: רצה II), but in MT the phrase in the former case is השבתה והזרה, while the latter reads והזרה והשבתיה. In SP, a unified formulation is created through the use of השבתה ואת השבתיה in both cases. On the other hand, SP retains the G form in the phrase השבתיה ואת השבתיה in 26:34a, so any formal harmonization remains only partial. Furthermore, the MT form והזרה in 26:43 is problematic (we would expectウォרצה), so SP may reflect a more original reading or an attempt at correction of an error, as opposed to a change intended to harmonize.

271 Ironically, this change in SP in a way undoes an earlier harmonization in a different direction: Exod 34:18 most likely represents a rewriting of the Covenant Code’s Mazzot law in light of Deuteronomy, with the expansion from ייצא...בחדש האבך כ in Deut 16:1b, ייצא...בחדש האבך before reflecting Deut 16:1b, ייצא...בחדש האבך כ, ייצא...בחדש האבך כ, ייצא...בחדש האבך, which Aland states for in the month of Abib YHWH your God brought you out from Egypt by night.” For a discussion of the use of earlier sources in Exodus 34, see Bernard M. Levinson, "The Revelation of Redaction: Exodus 34:10-26 as a Challenge to the Standard Documentary Hypothesis," (forthcoming); Carr, "Direction of Dependence,” 127-30. For this particular change, see the chart on Carr’s p. 139.
appointed time in the month of Abib, for in it you came out from Egypt.”

Two further changes to the Passover legislation occur in Deuteronomy’s version of the laws. In the first, SP substitutes a common Priestly term for the time of the Passover sacrifice for Deuteronomy’s less specific term:

- Deut 16:4 MT: "Let none of the meat that you sacrifice in the evening on the first day remain until morning.
- Deut 16:4 SP: "Let none of the meat that you sacrifice between the evenings on the first day remain until morning."

Cf. Exod 12:6 MT: "...and they shall slaughter it…between the evenings”; see also Lev 23:5; Num 9:3, 5, 11.

In the second, we see once again a harmonization of formulation to that of a parallel verse occurring earlier in the Pentateuch:

- Deut 16: 8 MT: "and on the seventh day there shall be an assembly for YHWH your God”
- Deut 16:8 SP: "and on the seventh day there shall be a pilgrimage-festival for YHWH your God”

Cf. Exod 13:6 MT: "and on the seventh day there shall be a pilgrimage-festival for YHWH”

One final category into which these small alterations can be grouped is “interpretive” changes. Of course in a way all the changes being discussed here are interpretive in that they reflect particular decisions about the text and particular ways of

---

272 Raphael Weiss classifies both of these changes as “unintentional” synonymous variants as opposed to deliberate harmonization; Weiss, "נרדפים לשונות חילופי", 84, 136. Of course certainty is impossible, but the cluster of changes in the Passover law, relating to several different sources, makes intentional change seem somewhat more plausible in this case.
reading the text. But this group goes beyond the concern with language on the one hand and with the internal cohesion of the text on the other. For lack of a better word, it is more “exegetical.” For instance, in Gen 49:7, the Blessing of Jacob, Simeon and Levi’s wrath is described as עזר, “cursed,” in MT, but as עדיר, “mighty,” in SP. One could argue that this is simply an orthographic error, but it is more likely an apologetic change, avoiding cursing two of Jacob’s sons.\footnote{Gen 49:5–7 refers obliquely to Simeon and Levi’s slaughter of the men of Shechem after the abduction and rape of Dinah (Genesis 34). While the deed is condemned in Jacob’s blessing, some later interpreters viewed it with approbation; see e.g. Judt 9:2; Jub 30:23; and compare Tg. Ps-Jon. ad loc. The change in SP may reflect the same tradition; see Franz Delitzsch, A New Commentary on Genesis (trans. Sophia Taylor; 2 vols.; New York: Scribner & Welford, 1889), 2.373; August Dillmann, Genesis (trans. W. B. Stevenson; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1897), 2.457; Jürgen Ebach, Genesis 37-50 (HThKAT; Freiburg: Herder, 2007), 593.}

Another example which has already been mentioned in other contexts is the series of changes made to the laws of the goring ox in Exod 21:28–36, whereby the applicability of the laws is extended from oxen alone to any domestic animal. Besides the frequent addition of the phrase או כל בhma, “or any animal,” the extension also involves the substitution of בhma for שור to describe the offending animal and the use of the verb חה, “strike,” instead of נגח, “gore,” in 21:28, 29, 32, and 36.\footnote{As mentioned above, these changes appear to be absent in 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{9}; see DJD 9:104–5.}

The only parallel in the 4QRP mss to either of these last two categories is the instance in 4Q158 1–2 13 where the editor amends the earlier reading preserved in MT, על שור כף על, presumably reflecting a stricter interpretation of the rule involved. (I discussed this example earlier in the context of minor additions [שור], but since כף is changed to כפות this case also involves minor alteration.) However, it is
probably unwise to attribute too much significance to the absence of these types of changes in the 4QRP mss. If we only had a fraction of the full text of SP, some categories would probably not be attested either. That is to say, minor alterations may have been used in more ways in the 4QRP mss than we have evidence for now, simply because of their poor preservation. Nonetheless, it is interesting that SP has a relatively large number of minor alterations that harmonize parallel but distant verses, while none at all are preserved in the 4QRP mss. On the other hand, there are two cases in the 4QRP mss where harmonization between distant parallels is effected by a minor addition (4Q364 21 2, Deut 1:17//16:19; 4Q365 6b 5, Exod 15:19b//Exod 14:29), showing that these editors too could be sensitive to differences between parallels separated by a great deal of intervening text.

5.5 Replacements with Material from Elsewhere

In my investigation of SP, I discovered a number of changes that evinced a kind of compositional technique different from any of those I had identified in the RP mss. These changes are similar to additions of material from elsewhere, in that text is copied verbatim from another source into the new context. The difference is that, in these cases, some material is also omitted in the course of the insertion; in this way, the changes resemble minor alterations where one word is replaced with another, except on a larger scale, and with the requirement that the new version be derived from elsewhere in the Pentateuch. The changes differ from paraphrase in the degree to which extended portions of the source text, rather than allusions or key terms, are inserted. The title I have given this category of changes, “replacements with material from elsewhere,” indicates its two
major features: that some of the original text is replaced, i.e. omitted; and new material from elsewhere in the Pentateuch is inserted.

Some of these replacements occur in the context of the larger program evidenced in SP and related texts of inserting material from Deuteronomy into parallel sections of the books of Exodus and Numbers. In these cases, instances of direct overlap between the parallels seem to have prompted the omission of part of the original version in order to avoid redundancy. In the story of Moses’ appointment of judges, for example (Exod 18:17–27//Deut 1:9–18), the versions are different enough that they can stand side by side, except for the actual act of appointing the judges:

Exod 18:25, יבשה התו יישורא משל אמא רהים על העם, “So Moses chose capable men from all Israel and appointed them leaders over the people”

Deut 1:15, וידעים חכמים אנשים שבטיםך ראשיכם את ויתן, “So I took the heads of your tribes, wise and experienced men, and I appointed them as leaders over you”

The same act is involved in both verses: since Moses can only appoint the judges once, there is no obvious way both verses can be incorporated. So the editor responsible for this change simply chooses between them: he continues with the text of Deuteronomy that he has been following, with minor changes (such as the change to the third person) to adapt the verse to its context: ויתן את ראשיםشبטים אנסים חכמיםVersionUID יוחא את ראשים על העם. After Exod 18:24, SP reverts to Exod 18:26 only after the insertion of the whole of Deut 1:9–18; Exod 18:25 is wholly replaced by the parallel verse in Deuteronomy.

The same move takes place in SP Num 21:22:
TABLE 5.1
REPLACEMENT WITH MATERIAL FROM ELSEWHERE IN SP NUM 21:22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אستطيع לעברה בארץך לא נשתה מברוך המלך ולא נשתה מברר במר</td>
<td>אستطيع לעברה בארץך במרך במרך אלך לא אسور יין ושמעאל לא אסת ברוך במרך</td>
<td>אستطيع לעברה בארץך אאכל בכסף ושבעני ואכלתי ונימי בכסף והיה לי ושתיתי כי אunsafe ברגליי...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let me pass through your land.</td>
<td>Let me pass through your land.</td>
<td>Let me pass through your land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let me pass through your land.</td>
<td>I will go only by the highway;</td>
<td>By the king’s highway I shall go; I will not veer to the right or left;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We shall not turn aside in field or in vineyard.</td>
<td>I will not veer to the right or left.</td>
<td>I will not turn aside in field or in vineyard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We shall not drink well water; by the king’s highway we shall go until we pass your border</td>
<td>Food you shall provide me for money and I will eat, and water you shall give me for money and I will drink, only let me pass through on foot.</td>
<td>Food you shall provide me for money and I will eat, and water you shall give me for money and I will drink, only let me pass through on foot.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here, the latter two-thirds of the Numbers verse (לא נשתה מברוך המלך ולא נשתה מברר במר, “We shall not drink well water; by the king’s highway we shall go until we pass your border”) are displaced by the insertion of Deut 2:27–29. The editor appears to have considered this material “covered” by the contents of the inserted
material from Deuteronomy: Deut 2:27 includes the phrase בָּדוֹרֶךְ הַמֶּלֶךְ, “by the king’s highway I will go,”275 and 2:28 has וְמָמַשׁ בָּכַסְתִּי חַטָּב מֵלֶךְ אֲשֶׁר אָעֵבָה בָּרַגְלֶיהָ, “water you shall give me for money and I will drink, only let me pass through on foot.”

At other points, these “replacements from elsewhere” serve a harmonistic purpose, bringing a given verse into conformity with a parallel or creating a more consistent use of language. Two examples occur in legislative contexts. The first comes in the dietary laws of Deuteronomy 14. In the MT, Deut 14:8a, on the pig, begins and ends in exactly the same way as its parallel in Lev 11:7. Between these points, however, the Leviticus version is much longer. In SP, therefore, the extra material from the longer version (marked in bold) is spliced into Deut 14:8, replacing Deuteronomy’s short middle (only two words, underlined):

---

275 This is how the phrase reads in SP Numbers; in MT and SP Deut 2:27 the phrase is בָּדוֹרֶךְ בָּרַגְלֶיהָ, “I will go only by the road” (RSV); “I will keep strictly to the highway” (NJPS). It thus appears that the editor responsible for this change adjusted the insertion from Deuteronomy to incorporate the phrase בָּדוֹרֶךְ הַמֶּלֶךְ from Num 21:22, even as he deleted the verse that caused the adjustment. Note that the only other use of the phrase בָּדוֹרֶךְ הַמֶּלֶךְ in the Pentateuch is in the parallel message to the king of Edom in Num 20:17.
TABLE 5.2
REPLACEMENT WITH MATERIAL FROM ELSEWHERE IN SP DEUT 14:8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deut 14:8a (MT)</th>
<th>Lev 11:7</th>
<th>Deut 14:8a (SP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>וואת התוחנה</td>
<td>כי מפריס פרסה היא</td>
<td>וואת התוחנה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וואת התוחנה</td>
<td>ושסע שסע פרסה</td>
<td>numerical error in MT, replaced in SP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ולא גרה</td>
<td>ואחר דאר</td>
<td>וואת גרה לא ור</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>טמא היא לך</td>
<td>טמא היא לך</td>
<td>נפקיה היא לך</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And the pig, because it is cloven of hoof

*but has no cud*

it is unclean for you.

And the pig, because it is cloven of hoof

*and is cleft-hooved*

*but does not chew the cud*

it is unclean for you.

And the pig, because it is cloven of hoof

*and is cleft-hooved*

*but does not chew the cud*

it is unclean for you.

Num 8:16 presents another example. In the second half of the verse, God describes the special status of the Levites as the redemption-price for the firstborn of Israel. SP replaces the bulk of this formulation with the parallel in Num 3:12.

**Num 8:16 MT**

יְהִי נְצֵי נַצֵּים הָהָם לְהוֹדֵד בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הַחֹפֶת כִּי רָתָם בָּרוֹר כָּל, "For they are completely dedicated to me from among the children of Israel; in place of that which opens every womb, the firstborn of each from the children of Israel, I have taken them for myself."

**Num 8:16 SP**

יְהִי נְצֵי נַצֵּים הָהָם לְהוֹדֵד בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הַחֹפֶת כִּי רָתָם בָּרוֹר כָּל, יִשְׂרָאֵל לַחֹפֶת אֲחָת לְהוֹדֵד בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל "For they are completely dedicated to me from among the children of Israel, in place of every firstborn that opens the womb among the children of Israel."

**Cf. Num 3:12 SP**

זְאמִית הָלַחֹפֶת אֲחָת לַחֹפֶת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הַחֹפֶת כִּי יִשְׂרָאֵל לַחֹפֶת אֲחָת לְבַרְבּים, "See, I myself have taken the Levites from among the children of Israel, in place of every firstborn that opens the womb among the children of Israel."

276 Num 3:12 reads מְנֵי בָּרוֹר in MT but מְנֵי בָּרוֹר in SP.
Another pair of replacements with material from elsewhere both involve descriptions of the land of Israel. Unusually, they both involve abridgment, with the new version ending up substantially shorter than the original. Gen 10:19 describes the land allotted to the Canaanites, while Deut 34:2–3 describes the land as seen by Moses standing at the top of Mt. Pisgah before his death. Each incorporates a variety of details and place-names. As the chart below shows, SP levels both of them to a more standardized formulation drawn from a combination of Gen 15:18 and Deut 11:24.
# TABLE 5.3

**REPLACEMENT FROM ELSEWHERE IN SP GEN 10:19; DEUT 34:2–3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEFORE (MT)</th>
<th>AFTER (SP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Now the border of the Canaanites was from Sidon in the direction of Gerar as far as Gaza, in the direction of Sodom and Gomorrah and Admah and Zeboiim as far as Lasha...</td>
<td>Now the border of the Canaanites was from the River of Egypt as far as the Great River, the River Euphrates, and as far as the Western Sea...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And YHWH showed him the whole land; the Gilead as far as Dan and all of Naphtali and the land of Ephraim and Manasseh and all the land of Judah as far as the Western Sea, and the Negeb and the Plain—the valley of Jericho, city of palm trees, as far as Zoar...</td>
<td>And YHWH showed him the whole land, from the River of Egypt as far as the Great River, the River Euphrates, and as far as the Western Sea...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Gen 10:19**

**Deut 34:1b–3**

**Gen 15:18**

**Deut 11:24**
As a result of this leveling, Gen 10:19 and Deut 34:1–3 lose their particularity, and are transformed to idealized descriptions of the land. The replacements also serve to increase a sense of cross-referentiality and cohesion throughout the Pentateuch: they make clear that the land of the Canaanites (Gen 10:19) had exactly the same boundaries as the land promised to Abraham (Gen 15:18), and that precisely this same territory was promised by God through Moses to Abraham’s descendants, if they kept the terms of the covenant (Deut 11:24), and was shown to Moses prior to his death (Deut 34:1b–3).

The final example of this compositional technique that I will mention is noteworthy in that it appears to serve the same purpose as many of the large additions of material from elsewhere that are so characteristic of SP: to ensure that, when a command is given by God, there is a record of that command being carried out. Yet here it is not the absence of a command or of a fulfillment report that prompts the change, but a contradiction between the two:

Num 25:4 MT

YHWH said to Moses, ‘Take all the leaders of the people and have them impaled for YHWH in broad daylight, so that the wrath of YHWH’s anger might turn away from Israel.’"

Num 25:4 SP

YHWH said to Moses, ‘Order them to kill those men who have attached themselves to Ba’al Pe’or, so that the wrath of YHWH’s anger might turn away from Israel.’"

Cf. Num 25:5 MT

“So Moses said to the judges of Israel, ‘Each man of you, kill those of your men who have attached themselves to Ba’al Pe’or!’”

In the MT version of vv. 4–5, Moses immediately responds to YHWH’s command, but does not carry it out as instructed: While God seems to have commanded
that the leaders (עם ראשי כל) be put to death as punishment for the nation’s sin,
Moses instructs the leaders (ישראל שפטים, “Israel’s judges”) to execute those who had actually sinned. Moses appears to ignore or at least substantially reinterpret God’s instructions. In SP, which elsewhere evidences such concern that command and fulfillment correspond, this discrepancy was not allowed to stand. Interestingly, though, the fulfillment is not conformed to the command, but the command is changed so that it matches the fulfillment: according to SP Num 25:4, God commands Moses to do precisely what he does in 25:5—instruct the leaders to execute the offenders.277

Apparently, an editor felt that it was more appropriate that those who sinned be executed, rather than that the leaders be held responsible for the behavior of all the people. In siding with Moses against God in this way, this editor demonstrates that the concern to coordinate command and fulfillment does not necessarily involve any special valuation of the command (as God’s word) above the fulfillment.

5.6 Rearrangements

This is the only compositional technique remaining to be discussed for SP: I could find no credible examples of paraphrase in SP or its predecessors. Rearrangements, however, are found in a variety of sizes. They can be arranged into two major groups according to the purpose they serve: a few rearrangements in SP clarify or improve the

277 In 4QNum⁵ col 18, the word קח and part of the word והוקע are preserved, indicating that 4QNum⁵ agrees with MT at this point and does not contain the SP change; see DJD 12:237–38.
logical sequence of the text, while others (the majority) harmonize the verse(s) in question to other verses elsewhere in the Pentateuch.

The two cases in SP where rearrangement seems to function primarily as clarification are both relatively minor. The first, in Exod 34:4, simply involves removing the word "משה" from its place later in the verse and inserting it at the beginning, immediately after the first verb, thus clarifying the subject of the verse. The second example is a little more interesting:

Exod 20:18a MT: "וְכָלָה תֵבָּעָר אֲתָה הָרָּה וְאֵת הָשָׁפָר וַאֲתָה קֹל וַאֲתָה בֵּית הַשָּׁפָר וַאֲתָה הָרָּה... "And all the people saw the thunder and the torches and the sound of the shofar and the mountain smoking…"

Exod 20:18a SP: "וְכָלָה תֵבָּעָר אֲתָה הָרָּה וַאֲתָה שָׁמֶעָה וַאֲתָה קֹל וַאֲתָה בֵּית הָשָׁפָר וַאֲתָה הָרָּה... "And all the people heard the thunder and the sound of the shofar and saw the torches and smoking mountain…"

An editor working in the SP text tradition appears to have been troubled, quite naturally, by the idea of anyone “seeing” thunder or the sound of the shofar. He therefore added one word and rearranged the verse so that it makes more sense, with the people now hearing the thunder and shofar-blast and seeing the torches and smoking mountain.

Much more prevalent are cases where rearrangement serves to harmonize the passage with another biblical text. Some examples involve very minor interventions. For example, the SP version of the (traditional) tenth commandment in Deut 5:21 has the sequence "רעך בית רעה ואשת רעה—続けて רעה ואשת רעה" for the first two things not to be coveted. This sequence departs from that of MT Deut 5:21, which has "אשת רעה—בֵּית רעה, אשת רעה—בֵּית רעה", but matches the sequence of the parallel in Exod 20:17. Similarly, in the list of unclean birds in Deuteronomy 14, "the cormorant" (בע migrant), is moved from its position in 14:17 to near
the beginning of 14:16, where it follows המיס, “the little owl,” in conformity with Lev 11:17, which has the sequence יהוה המיס ואת השלם.

There are two larger cases of rearrangement in SP that follow this same principle. In SP Exodus 29, v. 21, which describes the sprinkling of the priests’ garments with blood from the purification offering, is removed from its location in MT and relocated after v. 28, which concludes the description of the elevation offering.278 The new sequence matches command to execution, since in Leviticus 8 it is only after the raising of the breast as an elevation offering that the priests’ garments are sprinkled (Lev 8:30).279 Finally, in SP, Exod 30:1–10, the instructions for the making of the incense altar, are relocated to after Exod 26:35.280 In a way this change improves the logical sequence of the section, since now the instructions for the incense altar occur along with the other instructions for the Tabernacle and its appurtenances (chs 25–27). However, the move also partially conforms the commands for the construction of the Tabernacle to the record of their fulfillment in Exodus 37, where the incense altar is made directly after the table and the lampstand that also are located in the Tabernacle but outside the Holy of Holies.281

278 This rearrangement is also attested in 4QpaleoExodm, where the text goes directly from Exod 29:20 to v. 22; unfortunately, the section of the text where v. 21 would have been relocated, after v. 28, is not preserved. See DJD 9:117–18.

279 Sanderson refers to this case as “parablepsis later corrected,” overlooking the parallel to Leviticus 8 created by the change; see Sanderson, Exodus Scroll, 234-35.

280 The same rearrangement is partially extant in 4QpaleoExodm; see DJD 9:112–13.

281 It should be noted that the resulting correspondence is not complete in general or specific terms. First, the “correct” placement for the instructions for the incense altar (when viewed from the perspective of the implementation section) would be after the instructions for the lampstand (25:31–40). (It is probably not coincidental, however, that the table and the lampstand—with which the incense altar is grouped in the implementation section—are mentioned in 26:35, immediately prior to the SP insertion.)
Comparing the rearrangements that occur in SP to those of the 4QRP mss presents some difficulties, largely because we have few clear cases of rearrangement to work with. Besides the rearrangement of the Decalogue in 4Q158 and the minor case of the different order of the twelve tribes of Israel in Num 13:4–15 according to 4Q365 (frag. 32), we have the cases of juxtaposition discussed above, where we cannot be entirely clear on what is going on. However, I have argued above that at least some of these cases, like the juxtaposition of the Sukkot laws of Deuteronomy and Numbers in 4Q366, are best regarded as rearrangements. It is interesting to note that all these major cases of rearrangements or possible rearrangements fall into the category of improving the logical sequence of the text: 4Q158’s rearrangement of the Decalogue solves the interpretive difficulties associated with various ideas about whether and at what point God’s words were mediated to the people; the juxtaposition of the Sukkot laws in 4Q366 points to a concern for the topical arrangement of law; the juxtaposition of Numbers 4 and 7 in 4Q365 seeks to improve the flow of the story by removing the disruptive legal material of chs 5–6; and the juxtaposition of the two halves of the story of the daughters of Zelophehad (Numbers 27 and 36) in 4Q365 also evinces a desire for topical arrangement and/or narrative continuity. None of these cases demonstrate the concern to coordinate or harmonize parallel events or laws that appears to have been the prime motivation for

Second, there are major discrepancies in sequence between the command and fulfillment sections of this part of Exodus which SP does not resolve, the most obvious being that the fulfillment section describes the making of the Tabernacle itself before describing any of its furniture (36:8–38:8), while the command section begins with the ark, the table, and the lampstand before going on to the Tabernacle itself. Nonetheless, the rearrangement witnessed by SP is clearly an attempt to improve upon the order preserved in MT, where the instructions for the incense altar are marooned between the instructions for the daily tamid offering and the command concerning a census and the half-shekel registration fee. For a contrasting view that regards the two locations as synonymous variants (in the sense that one is not clearly secondary to the other), see Sanderson, Exod. Scroll, 111.
rearrangement in SP. The one instance of rearrangement in the 4QRP mss that may point to this concern is the rearrangement of the Israelite tribes in Num 13:13–16 (4Q365 32 1–2) such that the tribe of Asher now appears last, which may have been done under the influence of other texts in which Asher appears last in a list of tribes. Not only is this a very modest change in terms of size; it is also not entirely clear that it does in fact represent a harmonization. It may be the case that 4Q365 here simply reflects another textual tradition.282

5.7 Summary

A more detailed look at the points of contact and difference between SP and its forebears and the 4QRP mss has yielded a much more complex picture than is usually recognized. Three main issues especially require discussion: the use of the various compositional techniques in the two groups of texts, the purposes for which those techniques were used, and the question of a single, purposeful redaction; that is, the history of the development of the SP text tradition.

With regard to compositional technique, it is crucial to note that all the compositional techniques identified in the 4QRP mss are also attested in SP, except for paraphrase. Furthermore, SP uses an additional technique, replacements with material from elsewhere. SP’s reworking of the Pentateuch is, I believe, not generally conceived

---

282 For a more complete discussion, see above, p. 186.
of as so diverse. But from the perspective of how the Pentateuch is reworked, there is little qualitative difference from the 4QRP mss.

However, size does matter, and quantitatively there are major differences between the SP group and the 4QRP mss. Unique additions of new material of any size greater than a word or two are rare in SP, and never come close in size to the multiple-line additions in 4Q158, 4Q364, and 4Q365, to say nothing of the multiple columns of new material in 4Q365a. SP presents one case of major rearrangement (the incense altar) and one case of moderate rearrangement (the sprinkling of the priestly vestments), while changes of sequence that are likely to be rearrangements occur more often in the 4QRP mss: one likely case of rearrangement in 4Q158 is accompanied by two major new juxtapositions of material in 4Q365, two in 4Q366, and two in 4Q367. Given the fragmentary preservation of the 4QRP mss, changes of sequence are proportionally much more frequent in them than in SP. On the other hand, SP employs major additions of material from elsewhere with a frequency unparalleled by any of the 4QRP mss except perhaps 4Q158.

The lack of major additions of new material or any type of paraphrase, along with the relative infrequency of changes of sequence (rearrangements), suggests that SP represents, as has long been argued, a more conservative reworking of the Pentateuch

\[283\] I do not mean to imply that scholars who work with SP are unaware of the various types of changes present; rather, the (justifiable) tendency to focus on the most pervasive changes, as well as the tendency to classify changes using a variety of compositional techniques as “harmonistic,” has meant that the full breadth of editorial work attested in SP tends to be overlooked. See e.g. the sweeping statement by Segal, “In the (pre-)Samaritan Pentateuch, the additions and harmonizations are taken from other sections of the Pentateuch, and are not composed ex nihilo by the scribe responsible for those changes,” Segal, "4QRevised Pentateuch," 394. (A somewhat more nuanced view is presented in Segal, "Text of the Hebrew Bible," 14.) Similarly, Sanderson: “The scribe was not free to add to revelation by creating his own words”; Sanderson, Exodus Scroll, 271. See also Crawford, Rewriting Scripture, 23, 37.
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than do the 4QRP mss.\textsuperscript{284} This impression of conservatism might seem to lead to the idea that the SP editors had more respect for the sanctity of the pentateuchal text, insofar as their major additions contained only material that was already found elsewhere in the Pentateuch.\textsuperscript{285} This of course is one very logical interpretation of the data. However, it is not a necessary conclusion. We have seen that the major alterations in SP nearly all result from a single concern: to increase the consistency of speech events. Perhaps the infrequency of major instances of other techniques simply indicates that the editors in the SP text tradition were not particularly interested in adding material or changing sequences. Outside of their specific concern, they may have been content to leave the text more or less as it stood.

This brings us to the issue of the uses to which the various compositional techniques were put. The discussion above demonstrated that in many cases, especially those involving minor changes, SP and the 4QRP mss address the same types of issues: problems with language, clarification, minor interpretive changes, sometimes even halakhic adjustments. There are several major differences, however, that deserve comment.

First, we noted how the major interventions by the editors responsible for SP almost all are concerned with two specific types of speech, namely commands and recollections. If a command is given, it must be fulfilled, and if someone reports that something was done or said at an earlier point, there must be a record of that event. It was

\textsuperscript{284} For this position, see Segal, "4QReworked Pentateuch," 394; Crawford, "Rewritten' Bible at Qumran," 3. A similar view is implied in Tov, "Rewritten Bible Compositions," 354.

\textsuperscript{285} For this view, though of course without reference to the 4QRP mss, most of which had not yet been published, see Sanderson, Exodus Scroll, 269, 300.
also observed that 4Q158 demonstrates the same concerns in its use of additions of material from elsewhere, but its editors did not limit their activity to the extreme cases where a command or fulfillment or event was actually missing from the text. Their changes serve to strengthen correspondences rather than actually to create them. This also extends in two cases to stressing the links between two independent events, without particular attention to speech. With its use of additions of material from elsewhere, 4Q158 seems to span the distance between the gap-filling of SP and a more comprehensive reflection on the interconnectedness of the biblical text that is characteristic of rabbinic literature. One wonders whether evidence of such deep reflection on the biblical text might actually demonstrate higher regard for the text on the part of the editor(s) of 4Q158 than on the part of the editors in the SP tradition!  

Second, although SP clearly demonstrates concern with the coherence and orderliness of the Pentateuch, it lacks one particular manifestation of this concern that occurs in some of the 4QRP mss: an interest in providing the text with a more logical sequence. 4Q365 presents an “improved” sequence in its juxtaposition of Numbers 4 and 7 in frag. 28 and Numbers 27 and 36 in frag. 36. 4Q366 shows a concern for the topical arrangement of law in its juxtaposition of the Numbers and Deuteronomy Sukkot laws (frag. 2). There are no clear signs of this type of activity in SP: rearrangement tends to take place for the purpose of conforming the sequence of one text to the sequence of a parallel, not for the sake of a more logical sequence per se. This lack of concern with

286 I thank Prof. James VanderKam for this observation. Although the idea that the editor that most interferes with the text might in fact have the highest regard for its sanctity seems paradoxical in our culture, where reverence is equated with faithful preservation, the evidence suggests that exact copying was only one of several ways current in Second Temple Judaism to express commitment to the text.
topical grouping helps explain why there are no major interventions in SP in the pentateuchal legal material, even though those texts are rife with parallels.\textsuperscript{287}

Third, even though it is inaccurate to refer to the large additions of material from elsewhere that are characteristic of SP as “harmonistic,” smaller additions from elsewhere and several other compositional techniques are used frequently in SP for the purpose of harmonization. Especially interesting are cases where a particular verse or passage is changed to bring it into conformity with another text some distance away. Changes for this purpose occur only twice in 4QRP (4Q364 21 2; 4Q365 6b 5), but are common in SP: many minor additions from elsewhere and minor alterations serve this purpose, as well as the major cases of rearrangement and several of the cases of replacement with material from elsewhere.

Given the prevalence of changes made for the purposes of harmonization, it may be justified to speak of SP as a more harmonistic text than the 4QRP mss. There is, however, some evidence requiring that this assertion be qualified somewhat. First, there are a few cases in the 4QRP mss where harmonization seems to be the goal: that concern is not absent from those texts. Besides the small examples that have been cited, the

\textsuperscript{287} The clearest explanation for SP’s relative disengagement with legal texts is that they do not directly purport to be equivalent. The priestly legislation in Leviticus and Numbers has as its narrative setting God’s speech to Moses from the tent of meeting (Lev 1:1; Num 1:1). The Covenant Code (Exodus 21–23), on the other hand, is situated at Mt. Sinai, while Deuteronomy’s law code is spoken by Moses on the plains of Moab. Though it is explicitly noted that Moses decrees the laws in accordance with God’s instructions (Deut 1:3; 6:1), there is no identification of the law code itself with God’s earlier revelation on Sinai. Thus, there is no sense that any of the law codes is, in a narrative sense, a repetition of any other, and therefore no need to make them conform to one another. As Segal puts it, “…the legal sections in Deuteronomy contains [sic!] no internal references to earlier source material that should have been known to the reader from any other section of the Pentateuch”; Segal, “Text of the Hebrew Bible,” 17. Because major intervention in law simply was not consistent with the goals of the editors of SP (and because SP does contain smaller-scale changes to legal texts), there is no warrant to conclude that SP avoided the law because it was regarded with a particular reverence, as Moshe Bernstein implies. See Bernstein, "What Has Happened to the Laws?,” 32-33, 47; Segal, "Text of the Hebrew Bible,” 14.
paraphrase in 4Q158 frag. 14 should be mentioned: if it really does present a version of Exod 6:6–8 that brings it closer in formulation to Exodus 15, then it constitutes a type of harmonization. Second, as I must keep repeating, the 4QRP mss are all very fragmentary, and their incomplete preservation means that we may be missing part of the picture. Perhaps it is best to say simply that SP shows more evidence of a concern with harmonization than do the extant remains of the 4QRP mss.

A final issue to discuss here concerns how we should think about the development of the text in the tradition that eventually became SP. As mentioned above, the textual evidence points in two directions. On the one hand, more clearly than any of the 4QRP mss, SP contains a series of changes that point to a specific redactional goal. It seems quite possible that the major changes to the plague and wilderness narratives and the handful of other changes that reflect the specific concern with command/fulfillment and recollections mentioned above are the work of a single editor.

It is possible that a first editor missed a case or two that fit the criteria for intervention, and a later scribe corrected the oversight, but the precise circumstances under which changes are introduced indicate that they are all likely to have originated within a short period of time. On the other hand, with SP we are fortunate to have evidence of several stages of composition that point to the gradual development of the text. I mentioned above the fact that SP’s purely sectarian tenth commandment is missing from 4QpaleoExod, suggesting that the Samaritans made only minor changes to a preexisting version of the text. Thus at the very least we have evidence for a pre-Samaritan version and a Samaritan

---

288 See the discussion above, section 2.10.3.

289 Tov, "Rewritten Bible Compositions," 351. See also Sanderson, Exodus Scroll, 311.
stage. Another series of changes, those concerning the goring ox and other animal laws in Exodus 21–22, also appears to be absent from 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m}, suggesting it too was added at a later stage, as also the SP change to Num 25:4 (God’s command to punish those worshipping Ba’al Pe’or) is absent in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}. Since there is nothing particularly Samaritan about these changes, they are likely to be unrelated to the Samaritan redaction and thus constitute an intervening stage. Furthermore, the Qumran evidence shows that the text did in some cases continue to develop beyond the point at which it was adopted by the Samaritans, since the “pre-Samaritan” texts attest some changes that are not present in SP. Finally, I have mentioned several cases where SP shares readings with the LXX, pointing toward some sort of early shared tradition.\textsuperscript{290}

We therefore have evidence in the SP group for multiple stages of the textual tradition, even if we can also posit that the changes most characteristic of SP may well have been made in the course of a single redaction. In this way, SP and its predecessors may provide a useful model for thinking about the development of the 4QRP mss. I have hypothesized a similar picture in the previous chapters, suggesting that some of the major changes in each 4QRP ms might have arisen together, while others, as well as the whole variety of more minor changes, may have occurred over a longer period of time. As we will see, the Temple Scroll on the whole presents quite a different picture.

To conclude this chapter, SP provides another example, alongside the five 4QRP manuscripts, of a reworking of the Pentateuch that shares some features with the others but presents its own distinguishing characteristics. The editor(s) responsible for SP used

\textsuperscript{290} See especially the moderately-sized pluses mentioned in n. 232 above.
most of the same compositional techniques as did the editors responsible for the 4QRP mss, and in many cases used them for the same or similar purposes. Yet some types of changes, such as major additions and paraphrases, are absent from SP, while others, especially addition of material from elsewhere, are used with great frequency for a distinctive purpose. In its use of replacement with material from elsewhere, SP also employs a technique not attested in the 4QRP mss. In both its similarities and its differences, then, SP provides an important analogue to the 4QRP mss.
CHAPTER 6:

POINTS OF COMPARISON II: THE TEMPLE SCROLL

The Temple Scroll (TS) has often functioned as a parade example of what is usually called the “genre” of rewritten Scripture. Because of its near-constant use of, reworking of, or allusion to the text of the Pentateuch, it is also discussed frequently as similar or analogous to the 4QRP mss. Yet the precise ways in which TS resembles what we find in the 4QRP mss in regard to its techniques of reworking Scripture remain to be explored.

Beginning with the editio princeps of TS published by Yadin in the late 1970s, several studies have devoted considerable attention to a detailed exposition of how Scripture is reworked in TS. Yadin’s list of six forms of editing in the Scroll has been quoted in many subsequent publications, and references to the scriptural sources for the Scroll’s formulations fill his line-by-line commentary on the text. Michael Wise’s

291 TS functions as a major example of “rewritten Scripture” in e.g. Segal, "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible," 11; VanderKam, "Wording of Biblical Citations," 46-48. On the other hand, Bernstein notes that the legal nature of TS has led to its exclusion from the “genre” of “rewritten Bible” in some discussions, since the other clear examples of “rewritten Bible” are largely narrative (Jubilees, the Genesis Apocryphon, Josephus’s Antiquities). However, its obvious and continuous engagement with the pentateuchal text requires that it be considered in discussions of texts that rework Scripture, as most recent scholars recognize. See Bernstein, "Rewritten Bible," 193-95.


293 For the list of editorial methods, see n. 23 above and Yadin, Temple Scroll, 1.71-88.
1990 study of TS, although it focuses on issues such as date, sources (other than the Pentateuch), and purpose, includes an appendix listing the scriptural sources for every line of the Scroll and indicating the procedures by which they were reworked or recombined. Dwight Swanson in his 1995 monograph explicitly states as his purpose “to lay a groundwork for understanding the exegetical methodology of the Scroll,” and discusses in detail the Scroll’s treatment of scriptural sources in the “Festival Law” (11QT 13–29), the “King’s Law” (cols 56:12–59:20), the “Purity Law” (cols 48:1–51:10), and the commands for the building of the sanctuary (cols 4–7). Important early articles by Brin and Kaufman also focus on techniques of reworking in TS.

Although each of these studies has contributed (in different ways and to different degrees) to our understanding of the Temple Scroll’s relationship to Scripture, all of them were published too early to incorporate comparisons with the 4QRP mss, fully published only since 1994. I am not aware of any detailed study of pentateuchal reworking per se in TS since 1995, much less any study that incorporates an analysis of compositional techniques in the 4QRP mss. Yet given the role TS has taken on in discussions of

---

294 Wise, Critical Study.

295 Swanson, Temple Scroll and the Bible. See also n. 23 above.


297 Two recent monographs each engage to a degree the issue of the use of Scripture in TS, though in each case the main focus lies elsewhere: Magnus Riska, The Temple Scroll and the Biblical Text Traditions: A Study of Columns 2-13:9 (Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2001); C.D. Elledge, The Statutes of the King: The Temple Scroll’s Legislation on Kingship (11Q19 LVI 12–LIX 21) (Cahiers de la Revue Biblique 56; Paris: Gabalda, 2004). Both of these works focus only on a small part of TS. Elledge considers the scriptural sources behind TS’s kingship law, but does not attempt a systematic description of the various ways in which Scripture is reused. Riska includes a chapter in which he classifies parts of cols 2–13 as “rewritten Bible” (using this term in a completely unconventional way to refer to passages that
rewritten Scripture in general and the 4QRP mss in particular, a comparison that goes beyond the general observations of recent articles is sorely needed. In this chapter, I will try to assess in some detail the nature and extent of the similarities between TS and the 4QRP mss as regards compositional technique.298 Since the focus of this dissertation is on the 4QRP mss, a full catalogue of compositional techniques employed in every part of TS is beyond the scope of my project. Rather, I have selected a series of passages of approximately one-half to one column in length that exemplify the various ways in which the author of TS manipulated and reworked the Pentateuch, and I will compare the techniques evidenced in those passages to those identified in the 4QRP mss.

For this chapter, I have departed from the procedure of the preceding chapters of ordering the discussion according to the categories of compositional technique that I have developed. Discussing one passage at a time and observing the various compositional techniques employed in each will convey a better overall sense of TS and the ways it interacts with the pentateuchal text than grouping together several examples of a single type of change and separating them from their context. TS’s reuse of the Pentateuch is in many ways more intricate and complex than anything we have seen in the 4QRP mss and texts in the SP group, and this complexity is best illustrated by examining entire passages in their context.

have only loose connections to a biblical source text) or “paraphrase” (passages that correspond more closely to a scriptural source but still contain some changes). Riska’s primary focus, however, is on the pentateuchal Vorlage of TS and thus on passages that show no substantial deviation from the Pentateuch. Neither Elledge nor Riska discusses the 4QRP mss in any detail.

298 I will address only briefly, at the end of the chapter, the patent overlaps in content between 4Q365 and TS that suggest a literary relationship.
6.1 Passage One: Minimal Changes (TS 63:1–8)

Some sections in TS, mostly located in the last fifteen or so columns of the Scroll, reproduce extensive stretches of pentateuchal material with only minimal changes. The eight first lines of TS col. 63, for example, adhere closely to Deut 21:3–9, which describes the procedure for removing bloodguilt in the case of a corpse found lying in the countryside. The only changes are as follows.

In line 2 (Deut 21:4), there is a minor rearrangement as well as a minor omission:

Deut 21:4 MT  יָרְשׁ וַלּא יִעָבֵד  וַלּא יִשְׁרֵע  "which is neither worked nor sown"

TS 63:2  יִעָבֵד וַלּא יָרְשׁ  וַלּא יִשְׁרֵע  "which is neither sown nor worked." 299

The omission may be intentional in this case since the grammar is somewhat smoother in the shorter reading. 300

A minor addition in line 5 may derive from TS’s Vorlage, as it is also attested in G:

Deut 21:6 MT  יִרְצֶחוּ אֲתֵי יִרְדָּמְתָּם עַל הַעֵגָלָה  יָרְשׁוּ אֲתֵי יָרְשָׁם עַל הַעֵגָלָה  "...they shall wash their hands over the calf"

TS 63:5  יִרְצֶחוּ אֲתֵי יִרְדָּמְתָּם עַל הַנּוֹתָנָה תְּפַלְּתוֹ הַגָּזִים  יָרְשָׁם אֲתֵי יָרְשָׁם עַל הַנּוֹתָנָה תְּפַלְּתוֹ הַגָּזִים  "...they shall wash their hands over the head of the calf"  301

Line 8 (Deut 21:9) contains three minor alterations and two minor additions:

299 Citations from the Temple Scroll follow Yadin’s transcription. I have included brackets indicating reconstructed text, but I have omitted dots and circlets.

300 Yadin, Temple Scroll, 2.284.

301 Yadin suggests that the addition is intended “to link the text with the laying of hands on the head of the sin offering in general, and, in particular, on the bull sin offering of the congregation” (Lev 4:15); see Yadin, Temple Scroll, 2.284.
Deut 21:9 MT

тяויה יב痱 תבש חמש אין פָּרֹשֶׁה יב稣 יבעי יוהו

“And you shall purge the innocent blood from your midst; indeed, you shall do what is right in the eyes of YHWH.”

TS 63:7–8

ותא תבש אשת יבניך פָּרֹשֶׁה יב稣 יבעי יוהו אוּלָהוֹכָה

“And you shall purge the innocent blood from Israel, and you shall do what is right and good before me, YHWH your God”

The replacement of ותעשה with ועשה may well be an attempt to smooth the syntax of the verse, as the function of כי is not entirely obvious in this context.302 The three final modifications (אלוהיכו, לפני, and והטוב) seem designed to bring this half-verse into conformity with formulations found elsewhere in the Scroll; see TS 53:7–8 והטוב מהרש והמשט פָּרֹשֶׁה יוהו אוּלָהוֹכָה (Deut 12:28) and 55:14 הרש והמשט פָּרֹשֶׁה יוהו אוּלָהוֹכָה (Deut 13:19). Given the parallels, the two small additions are best considered small additions of material from elsewhere, although to be precise the nearest source of the additions is the formulation in an earlier passage in TS, not a formulation found elsewhere in MT or another known version.303

302 Aejmelaeus notes that כי can sometimes function in Biblical Hebrew essentially as a clause coordinator, with very little retention of the causal meaning that it usually has when it appears between two clauses. She suggests that, while עם functions as a “universal connective,” כי “appears in argumentative texts as a kind of argumentative coordinator.” Though she does not discuss Deut 21:19, deuteronomic law would certainly seem to fit the category of “argumentative texts.” See Anneli Aejmelaeus, “The Function and Interpretation of כי in Biblical Hebrew,” in On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993), 165-85, at p. 181.

303 In all three instances, MT SP reads לפני, and the word אני in 53:8 is an addition meant to adapt the verse to TS’s setting as the direct speech of God. Otherwise, TS’s reading follows SP in 53:7–8 and SP G in 55:14.
6.2 Passage Two: A Series of Laws Grouped by Topic (TS 52:1–21)

This second passage differs from the first in that, besides the minor changes found there, it contains various types of more substantial modifications, especially rearrangements of sequence and addition of new material. The major effect of the changes is that TS here leaves off following the biblical text sequentially and instead presents a group of laws dealing with domestic animals and the rules for proper sacrifice of them.

The extant portion of the column begins with Deuteronomy 16:21–22 in lines 1–2, following on from the beginning of the “deuteronomistic” portion of the Scroll in 51:11, which contains Deut 16:18. A large insertion, presumably containing injunctions against foreign religious practices and the worship of other gods, began in 51:19 and must have continued through most of the lacuna between cols 51 and 52. Since 51:19 contains a clear reference to Deut 16:21 (the collocation אשת אָשֶׁר occurs only here), the more precise reuse of that verse in 52:1–2 may have the character of a repetitive resumption, bracketing the insertion. In any case, once TS moves on to Deut 16:22, it takes advantage of a parallel formulation to include related material from Lev 26:1.
TABLE 6.1

COMBINATION OF DEUT 16:22 AND LEV 26:1 IN TS 52:2–3

| Do not erect for yourself a standing stone, which YHWH your God hates. | Deut 16:22 |
| Do not make for yourselves idols, and do not erect for yourselves a graven image or a standing stone, and a carved stone you shall not set up in your land so as to prostrate yourselves to it, for I am YHWH your God. | Lev 26:1 |
| Do not erect for yourself a standing stone, [which I hate, and a carved stone you shall not make for yourself in all your land so as to prostrate yourself to it. | TS 52:2–3 |

Since it does not seem that Lev 26:1 appeared anywhere else in the Scroll, this insertion represents a moderate rearrangement: this half-verse was given a new context as part of the deuteronomic law proscribing idolatry.

Line 4 returns to Deuteronomy with the next verse, 17:1. Aside from the typical change from third-person אלהיך to first person לי, the only change of any significance is the following:

Deut 17:1 MT

"You shall not sacrifice to YHWH your God an ox or a sheep in which there is a blemish, any serious problem"

TS 52:4

"You shall not sacrifice to me an ox or a sheep in which there is any serious blemish."
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This change constitutes a *minor alteration* or, perhaps better, a *minor replacement from elsewhere*; in either case it conforms the formulation of this verse to the prohibition of slaughtering a firstling with a blemish (see Deut 15:21 and TS 52:10, below).

In line 5 we find the injunction לוֹא תֹּבֵח לוֹא שֶׁר שֶׁר וְהָמָה מְפֹלָטָה כְּתוּבָה הָמָה לְךָ, “You shall not sacrifice to me an ox or a sheep or a goat that is pregnant, for it is an abomination to me.” This is not a law found in the Pentateuch; thus it is an *addition of new material*. Interestingly, the addition is clearly modeled upon the preceding law regarding animals with blemishes (both open with the phrase לוֹא תֹּבֵח לְךָ). As the rest of this chapter will demonstrate, it is a characteristic feature of TS that new content—laws or other materials that are not found in the Pentateuch—is often patterned after existing texts.

Line 6 continues the collection of related materials from around the Pentateuch, first including Lev 22:28, אחד ביום תָּשָׁחְטוּ לא בְנוֹו ואתו השָׁה או ושור, “An ox or a sheep, it and its offspring, you shall not slaughter on the same day.” The only noteworthy change made by the author of TS is the *minor alteration* תֹּבֵח for תָּשָׁחְטוּ, probably to make the language of the law consistent with the other laws in this section.304 Following this, TS moves to Deut 22:6b, לא תֹּכָה הָאָם עַל בֵּנַי, “You shall not take the mother along with the young.” The author makes one important alteration to this clause, so that it now reads ולא תֹּכָה הָאָם על הבנות, “You shall not *slay* a mother along with (her) young.” This minor alteration serves to adapt the clause to its new context: in Deut 22:6, the context is the discovery of a bird’s nest, with the mother bird brooding over eggs or

---

304 For a discussion of this change, see Zahn, "New Voices," 444-45.
hatchlings. In that context, התָּלָה, “take,” is appropriate, whereas here the reference is clearly to sacrificial animals, and התָּהַה, “strike, slay,” is more fitting. Furthermore, in this case we are not dealing with rearrangement, but with addition of material from elsewhere, since Deut 22:6 appears in its entirety in TS 65:2–4.

From the topic of mothers and young of animals suitable for sacrifice TS moves to the related subject of the firstlings of domestic animals. 52:7–12 contains the text of Deut 15:19–23 with relatively few changes aside from the ubiquitous change to the first person in references to God. There is a minor omission; אתָּה בִּתֵּךְ is removed from the end of Deut 15:20. More significant is a small addition to the end of v. 23:

Deut 15:23 MT: רק את דמו לא תאכל על הארץ תשפכנו כמים, “Only its blood you shall not eat; you shall pour it out on the ground like water.”

TS 52:11–12: רק הדם לא תאות על הארץ תשפכנו כמים וכסיתו, “Only the blood you shall not eat; you shall pour it out on the ground like water and cover it with dust.”

Cf. Lev 17:13: ישהפ את דמו ומסת בשר, “he shall pour its blood out and cover it with dust.”

The same addition is made to Deut 12:24 in TS 53:5–6. According to the classificatory terms I have developed thus far, this change is a rearrangement, since Lev

---

305 Yadin agrees that Deut 22:6b is included at this point, but also suggests that the specific formulation here is based on Gen 32:12, מַפְתָּה הוֹבֵנִי אֶל בְּנִי, “lest he come and slay me [= my household], mother and children together”; Yadin, Temple Scroll, 2.233. It is not clear to me, however, that the presence of the verb התָּהַה here in TS mandates a connection with Gen 32:12. If we presume that the author intended to include Deut 22:6b at this point, but realized that the verb התָּלָה was not appropriate to the context, it seems just as likely that he would independently choose a more neutral verb like התָּהַה as draw on an only marginally related nonlegal passage for the formulation.

306 For this phenomenon, which creates the impression that TS is a direct record of God’s words to Moses on Mt. Sinai, see Yadin, Temple Scroll, 1.71-73; Lawrence H. Schiffman, "The Temple Scroll and the Halakhic Pseudepigrapha of the Second Temple Period," in Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls (eds. Esther G. Chazon and Michael E. Stone; STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 121-31.
17:13 does not appear elsewhere in the Scroll. In this case, the original law to which the provision applied, the slaughter of wild game, is omitted from TS’s version of pentateuchal law, but since Deut 12:22–24 (on nonsacrificial slaughter) and 15:22–23 (on blemished firstlings) both compare the object of their law to wild game, and since those laws both require the pouring out of the animal’s blood, the author reasoned that covering the blood with dust, required for wild game, was also required here.\(^{307}\)

Line 12 continues with Deut 25:4, יָשָׁב בָּשָׁהוּ שִׁיר הָשָׁה יְשָׁב, “You shall not muzzle an ox while it threshes” (MT), followed in line 13 by Deut 22:10, יָשָׁב בָּשָׁהוּ בָּשָׁה יָשָׁב, “You shall not plow with an ox and a donkey together” (MT). Since these laws do not concern sacrifice, their inclusion here seems a bit odd. Perhaps they were inserted because of their focus on domestic animals.\(^{308}\) In neither case does the version of the law in TS differ in any substantive way from the MT version.

---

\(^{307}\) Yadin refers to this as an “extreme case of harmonizing” (2.234). However, Yadin hints elsewhere at a different dynamic. The purpose here appears to be not so much harmonizing of texts as halakhic “homogenization” (a term coined by Milgrom): a prescription originally limited to a single law (the disposal of the blood of wild animals) is taken to apply also to similar laws (the disposal of the blood of domestic animals not slaughtered at the altar). See Yadin, Temple Scroll, 1.315; Schiffman, "Deuteronomic Paraphrase," 560. On the principle of homogenization, see Jacob Milgrom, "The Qumran Cult: Its Exegetical Principles," in Temple Scroll Studies (ed. George J. Brooke; JSPSup 7; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 165-80, at pp. 171-75.

\(^{308}\) Yadin asserts that these two laws were included here because they are “out of place” in their biblical locations. It is true that Deut 25:4 does not have any ties to its surroundings, sandwiched as it is between laws for corporeal punishment (25:1–3) and levirite marriage (25:5–10)—although the two sets of laws on either side do not have much connection to one another either. Deut 22:10, however, fits perfectly well among other laws prohibiting certain mixtures. Yadin agrees that the laws were probably inserted because they dealt with animals, but suggests that the primary reason for the insertion was the proximity of 22:10 to 22:6, “you shall not take the mother with the young,” which was cited earlier in the column. This explanation fails to convince, first because it does not account for the presence of 25:4, and second because there is no clear evidence that the author worked in such an associative way, here or elsewhere. For the discussion, see Yadin, Temple Scroll, 1.315-16. Envisioning a sort of key-word connection as opposed to a general topical connection, Brin suggests instead that both laws were included because they pertain to a שָׁיָּהוּ "ox"; he also points to the occurrence of the word יָשָׁב, “together,” in the law for eating a blemished firstling (TS 52:11) and in Deut 22:10. See Brin, "משה בָּשָׁהוּ השָׁהוּ השָׁהוּ יְשָׁב, " 208.
In lines 13–16, TS contains a law requiring that all clean animals—that is, those fit for sacrifice—from all Israelites who live within a three-days’ journey of the Temple be slaughtered inside the Temple as a burnt offering or peace offering: there is no secular slaughter permitted for those living within this distance from the Temple. The text is worth quoting in full:

14              בְּכַל שָׁעְרֵיהֶם קַרְבַּן תַּמְדִיד לְמַעֲשֵׂה וּמְדִינָה נִמֵּשׁ כְּאוֹס בַּתּ
15              מַקְדִישׁ תַּחֲרוֹנִי לְעַשָּׂה אֹתָהוּ עַלָּהּ וּבָהּ שְׁלַמִּים אֶפֶלֶתָה
16              וְשָׁמָּה מַחֲנָה לְפָנִי בְּכָנָה אַשְׁרָא אֱלֹהִים לִשְׁמוֹ שָׁמֶר שָׁם עַלָּהוּ

13 You shall not slaughter a clean ox or sheep or goat
14 in any of your gates within a three-days’ journey of my temple, but inside
15 my temple you shall sacrifice it, so as to make it a burnt offering or an offering
of well-being, and you shall eat
16 and rejoice before me in the place upon which I will choose to place my name.

This short paragraph has connections of content and language with both
Deuteronomy 12 and Leviticus 17. Deuteronomy 12 famously confines all cultic sacrifice
to the single “place that YHWH will choose,” while allowing non-sacrificial slaughter
away from the Temple for the purposes of meat consumption. Leviticus 17 appears to
take a stricter view, requiring that all slaughtered animals be brought “to the entrance of
the tent of meeting” and offered sacrificially.\(^{309}\) In this passage, TS charts a middle
course and implicitly suggests a resolution to the tension between the two laws, banning
secular slaughter for those within a three-days’ journey of the Temple.\(^{310}\) That TS did
allow for some non-sacrificial slaughter is indicated by the beginning of col. 53, which
contains Deut 12:21–25, a text that allows for secular slaughter “if the place that YHWH


\(^{310}\) For a discussion, see Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 1.316-20.
your God will choose is too far from you." It is unclear whether any connection was originally made at the top of col. 53 to the law in 52:13–16, but a natural assumption would be that the author of TS has concretized Deuteronomy’s vague “too far from you” into the absolute distance of a three-days’ journey.

---

311 It should be noted that the preceding paragraph (Deut 12:13–19) appears to permit secular slaughter no matter where one is in relationship to the Temple, just as long as the slaughter is for the purpose of eating meat and is not sacrificial in nature. On the relation of the two paragraphs, see Bernard M. Levinson, *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 39-42.

312 In two recent publications, Aharon Shemesh has argued that the intent of the author in TS 52:13–16 was not to prohibit non-sacral slaughter, as most commentators have assumed, but to prohibit sacrificial slaughter within a three-days’ journey of the Temple; see Aharon Shemesh, ""Three-Days' Journey from the Temple": The Use of this Expression in the Temple Scroll," *DSD* 6 (1999): 126-38; Aharon Shemesh, "A New Reading of 11QT* 52:13-16," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After Their Discovery* (eds. Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society/Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000), 400-10. This position, with its implication that TS permitted sacrifice (though presumably only to YHWH!) in locations more than three days from the Temple, is only made at all plausible by Shemesh’s concomitant argument that “three days’ journey” in fact represents, for the author of TS, the borders of the Land of Israel. He bases himself partly on an interpretation of Exod 8:21–22, where Pharaoh’s suggestion that Israel sacrifice to its God “within the land” is met by Moses’ rejoinder that, since the Israelites’ sacrifice is odious to the Egyptians, it must be performed where the Egyptians cannot witness the sacrifice; thus he requests permission to journey three days into the wilderness. I do not think that this one exchange can support Shemesh’s claim that “three-days’ journey” does not necessarily indicate a precise distance but rather designates an area outside the boundaries of the land.” (Shemesh, "Three-Days' Journey," 127.) Shemesh’s second main argument is also problematic: based on the Mishnah’s description of the distance of a single day’s journey from Jerusalem, he calculates that a three-days’ journey would have encompassed all of the Land of Israel except perhaps the Upper Galilee. (Shemesh, "Three-Days' Journey," 126; Shemesh, "New Reading," 406.) One might object that such a radius from Jerusalem would also encompass a great deal of territory outside the land, thus viatting the analogy between a three-days’ journey and the borders of Eretz Israel. A more pertinent objection is that the author of TS is unlikely to have taken such a pragmatic perspective, since pragmatism does not seem to be of primary concern in the Scroll: after all, TS allows no one to defecate within the Temple City (46:13–16), and the dimensions of the Temple courts are so vast that implementation of them would have required a major terraforming operation in which, among other changes, the Kidron valley would have to be filled in; see Magen Broshi, "The Gigantic Dimensions of the Visionary Temple in the Temple Scroll," in *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Hershel Shanks; London: SPCK, 1993), 113-15. Without the assumption that “three days’ journey” refers to the entire land, there is no compelling reason to interpret TS 52:13–16 as referring to sacrifice as opposed to non-sacral slaughter; the passage makes more sense when viewed as an exegetical response to the vague “too far from you” of Deut 12:21, with non-sacral slaughter at issue.
With regard to compositional technique, TS 52:13–16 seems best regarded as a (condensing) paraphrase of Deuteronomy 12. More specifically, the author seems to have drawn primarily on Deut 12:5–7. The כי אם ואת מקדשים הובחנו (condensing) recall Deut 12:5–6. "But rather, to the place that YHWH will choose...you shall turn, and come there, and bring there your burnt offerings and your sacrifices...” (cf. also v. 14). The mention of שלמים והலויים (TS 52:15) is loosely parallel to the list of sacrifices, beginning with שלמים והלויים, in Deut 12:6, though the actual formulation in TS is based upon a different source (see below). To לפני ושמחתה ואכלתה we can compare Deut 12:7, "And you shall eat there before YHWH your God, and you shall rejoice in all your undertakings...” (cf. also 12:12, 18). Although various versions of the centralization formula (see line 16, כ helys אבחר اسم ושם עליה) occur throughout this chapter (Deut 12:5, 11, 14, 18, 21, 26), only 12:5 and 21 resemble TS 52:16 in reading וליה (את) שמה שם שלמים. The phrase בכל שלמים (את) שמה שם שלמים does not occur in Deut 12:5–7, but does appear in 12:15 (and cf. בshall) in vv. 17, 18, and 21). Thus this passage follows the contours of Deut 12:5–7 without actually reproducing more than a few words of the passage at a time.


A few aspects of this passage, however, point not to Deuteronomy 12 but in another direction. The opening clause of the law, "וַהֲלוֹא תֹּבֵרָה שָׁם וּשְׁתֵּי נְמוּרִים", follows the pattern of the laws in 52:4 and 5, which both open "וַהֲלוֹא תֹּבֵרָה לֹא..." In its mention of slaughter and the list of animals, it also resembles somewhat the formulation of Lev 17:3–4, "אַשָּׁר אֲשֶׁר מַבִּית יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר יָשָׁתֶם שָׁם הַבֵּית...וַעֲלָה עַל מַעֲדַת לֵאמָר, 3–4,4 "Any man from the house of Israel who slaughters an ox or a lamb or a goat...and does not bring it to the entrance of the tent of meeting..." Again, from the perspective of compositional technique, one could argue that TS has paraphrased the casuistic legal formulation of Lev 17:3–4 (which determines that anyone found slaughtering outside the tent of meeting will be "cut off from the midst of his people") into an apodictic prohibition: "You shall not slaughter a clean ox or sheep or goat in any of your gates..."

Further evidence that the author of TS had Lev 17:3–4 in mind comes from the phrase לְעַשֵּׁה אוֹתוֹ לִעַשֵּׁה וְאֵיל הָשָּׁם. Here TS appears to be citing a text tradition other than that represented by the MT: while the phrase לְעַשֵּׁה אוֹתוֹ in reference to a sacrificial animal occurs in MT only at Lev 17:9, an addition to 17:4 attested in LXX, SP, and 4QLev—contains the clause לְעַשֵּׁה אוֹתוֹ לִעַשֵּׁה לְיהוָה. The almost exact repetition of this clause in TS suggests strongly that it was present in the author’s pentateuchal Vorlage. Finally, the distinctive addition from the author, קרוב 315

315 On this plus, see David Andrew Teeter, "Exegesis in the Transmission of Biblical Law in the Second Temple Period: Preliminary Studies" (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 2008). Teeter argues convincingly that the plus is a secondary exegetical expansion, based on the language of Lev 17:8–9 and intended to suggest that the whole of Lev 17:1–9 pertains only to sacral slaughter, thus removing any tension between this law and the permission for non-sacral slaughter granted in Deuteronomy 12. For an earlier analysis of the plus, which, however, does not examine its origins and purpose in detail and assumes that it pertains to non-sacral slaughter (a position that Teeter disproves), see
tempts רודר שלושת ימים, effects an interpretive compromise between Deuteronomy 12 and Leviticus 17, neither banning secular slaughter outright nor permitting it outright.

The subject of eating meat returns the author to the issue of blemished animals. So far, col. 52 has repeated the pentateuchal laws concerning animals with a מום: animals with a blemish cannot be sacrificed (Deut 17:1 = 52:4), and, more specifically, firstlings with a blemish cannot be sacrificed but may be eaten in the towns (Deut 15:21–22 = 52:9–12). The Pentateuch does not specifically detail what should be done with clean, non-firstling animals with blemishes, so the author of TS creates a new law that is clearly extrapolated from Deut 15:21–22:

TS 52:16–19: כל הבהמה הטהורה אשר שיש בה מום ובשעירה ומוטלת רוחק, "Any clean animal which has a blemish: you shall eat it in your gates, far from my temple (at a distance of) thirty stadia all around; you shall not slaughter (it) near my temple, for it is foul flesh."

This law addresses a topic not covered in the Pentateuch, yet it is not simply an addition of new material. The author of TS draws on the language of specific pentateuchal laws in order to construct at least part of his new law. The first clause, כל הבהמה הטהורה אשר יש בה מום, appears to be an expanded version of the opening of Lev 22:20, "Anything which has in it a blemish (you shall not offer)." The next clause, בשעריכה, "in your gates you shall eat it,” is precisely


316 Yadin traces the formulation in TS back to Gen 7:2, ממל יב הוי והבשה והשון חק לאל, "From all the clean animals you shall take seven and seven”; Yadin, Temple Scroll, 2.235. The
equivalent to Deut 15:22a, which refers to eating blemished firstlings. The reuse indicates the author’s train of thought: he is regarding all blemished animals like blemished firstlings. The rest of this new law, however, lacks clear connections to specific pentateuchal verses. Thus in this instance addition of material from elsewhere is combined with addition of new material.

The situation is similar for the final extant lines of col. 52:

TS 52:19–21: "לֹא תַּאכְלוּ בְּשָׁם שָׁור מִצָּה הַמִּקְדָּשׁ נַעֲרֵי אַשָּׁר אֶשְׁרָא אֵילֵי שָׁם מָשָׁא בְּשָׁם שָׁם מָשָׁא לְכָל אָדָם תְּאכִילָה תְּאכִילָה אָדָם תְּאכִילָה..."

You shall not eat the flesh of an ox or sheep or goat within my city which I consecrate to put my name there which does not come within my Temple, and they shall sacrifice there and sprinkle its blood on the base of the altar of burnt offering, and its fat they shall turn to smoke…"

The author now provides the corollary of the law prohibiting secular slaughter near the Temple: he prohibits the consumption of non-sacrificial meat within the Temple city. No such rule, referring specifically to eating, is made explicit in the Pentateuch. Again, much of the law is the formulation of the author, but at several points it becomes evident that the author is drawing upon a specific passage for some of his language. In this case, Lev 17:3–6, which prohibits slaughter anywhere besides the tent of meeting,

underlying assumption that every phrase in TS that has a biblical parallel, no matter how remote, must have been influenced by that parallel is characteristic of Yadin’s comments on the use of the Bible in TS, and also recurs in the monograph by Swanson. However, no matter how clearly the author of TS wanted to make his text sound “biblical,” he need not have had a specific biblical verse in mind for everything he wrote. His familiarity with the text would have allowed him to mimic its register and vocabulary even without referring to specific verses. Thus there is no good reason to assume a connection with Gen 7:2 here; more likely, the phrase הבמה הרוחית (referring to clean, unblemished animals) in 52:13.
constitutes the source. Although several circumstances have changed (eating vs. slaughter, Temple city vs. desert camp), some clear points of contact are evident.

To לָאֹחָל בֵּשָׁר שָׁוֶא יֵשׁ בְּתוֹמָד עָדְי

Compare Lev 17:3 אַף אָשֶׁר יִשָּׁהֶה מְשֹר אוֹ כֹּבֶשׁ אוֹ יִזְכָּחֵה... “Any man...who slaughters an ox or a lamb or a goat within the camp...”

To אַשֶׁר לֹא בָנָה בְּתוֹךְ מֵמקְדֶשׁ

Compare Lev 17:4 אֲלֵי פָּתָח אַתָּה מִשְׁעַד לָאֲשִׁיר “and does not bring it to the entrance of the tent of meeting”

To וַחֲבֹתֶם שְׁמֵהֶם אַחֲרֵי דֶמֶם אֵלֶּה מְשֹר הַעֲוָלוֹת אַחֲרֵי דֶמֶם יִקְטִירו

Compare Lev 17:5–6 וַחֲבֹתֶם שְׁמֵהֶם...וַחֲכֹת הַכֹּהֵן אַתָּה דֶמֶם אֵלֶּה מְשֹר הַעֲוָלוֹת הַקִּטֵּר...וְרָצַּחו... “And they shall slaughter sacrifices of well-being...and the priest shall scatter the blood upon YHWH’s altar...and he shall turn the fat into smoke...”

These parallels make clear that, even though he exercised complete freedom in constructing his new law, the author of TS based the law on a similar law already found in the Pentateuch. Again, an addition is created out of a mixture of new material and material from elsewhere.

6.3 Passage Three: One Law out of Many (TS 17:6–16)

The Temple Scroll is well known for combining parallel laws into a single command; as Yadin put it, “unifying duplicate commands.”\(^{318}\) A prime example of this phenomenon is TS’s law for the festivals of Pesach and Mazzot in col. 17. The Pentateuch contains laws pertaining to these two festivals not only in the various festival calendars (Exod 23:15; 34:18; Lev 23:5–8; Num 28:16–25; Deut 16:1–8), but also in Exod 12:1–28; 13:3–10; Num 9:1–14. TS presents only a single law on Pesach and Mazzot, drawing on different elements of the various laws but also adding its own clarificatory remarks.

The law on Pesach that opens in line 6 appears to begin in familiar fashion, although the column is still somewhat fragmentary at this point. Reconstructing the lacunae according to Lev 23:5, Yadin reads:

\[
ועש
\]

\[
̇ו
\]

\[
בארב
\]

\[
הראישון
\]

\[
בחושד
\]

\[
עשר
\]

\[
̇ה
\]

\[
̇ע
\]

\[
ליהוהבין
\]

\[
פסח
\]

\[
הערבים
\]

“[And] they [shall perform on the fourteenth of the first month, between the evenings, a Passover to YHWH]”\(^{319}\)

The date is mentioned at the opening of the laws in Lev 23:5; Num 9:3; 28:16, although never exactly in this form. Lev 23:5 and Num 28:16 both present the month before the day, בחדש יום עשר באורב הראישון, but Numbers 9 has the day before the month, בחדש עשר באורב, since TS also has this sequence, the author may have had Numbers 9 specifically in mind at this point. On the other hand, he may simply have changed the sequence to match the introduction to the law on Mazzot in

---

\(^{318}\) Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 1.74.

\(^{319}\) Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 2.74.
17:10: “And on the fifteenth day of this month…”; here TS matches Lev 23:6; Num 28:17 exactly.

After this general instruction which opens the law, TS includes at least two extrabiblical prescriptions:

TS 17:7–8: וזבחו לפני מנחת הערב ובחו [مواשׁי שֵׁמוֹ וּמְעִלָּה וּשְׁעוֹת], “And they shall sacrifice it before the evening sacrifice, and they shall sacrifice [? ... ] From twenty years and up they shall keep it…” (TS 17:7–8).

Both extant clauses constitute halakhic clarifications of aspects of the law that are not spelled out in the pentateuchal legislation. The first addresses the issue of the order of sacrifice: was the Passover to be slaughtered before or after the daily tamid offering?320 The second legislates the age from which observance of Pesach was required.321 The lacuna in the middle clause is unlikely to have contained more than a single word; Yadin suggests [مواשׁי] ובחו, “and they shall sacrifice at its appointed time.” This reading is really no more than a guess, but if it is correct it would constitute a reference to Num 9:3, “On the fourteenth day…you shall observe it at its appointed time.” Besides this reconstructed reference, these clauses constitute from the compositional point of view additions of new material; they do not use language from any particular biblical verse.

320 It should be noted that the decision in TS, that the Pesach is to be slaughtered before the afternoon tamid offering, contradicts the rabbinic position; see Yadin, Temple Scroll, 1.96-97.

321 The Passover law in the book of Jubilees contains the same nonpentateuchal prescription (Jub 49:17).
The rest of the law for Pesach paraphrases several aspects of the pentateuchal legislation. It reads:

TS 17:8–9: "and they shall eat it at night in the courts of the holy place, and they shall get up early and each shall go to his tent."

The sequence of eating—place of eating—return makes clear that the source of the paraphrase is Deut 16:7, "You shall boil it and eat it in the place that YHWH your God will choose, and you will turn in the morning and go to your tents." The insertion of "בלילה," "at night," may reflect a conscious reference to Exod 12:8, "and they shall eat the meat on this night..." This is the only verse that explicitly states that the Passover is to be eaten at night, although this can be inferred from other verses that require the sacrifice to be performed at evening and forbid leaving any of the meat over until the next morning (Num 9:3–4, 11–12; compare Deut 16:6–8). The phrase "בחצרות הקדש" is functionally equivalent to Deuteronomy's statement that the Pesach must be eaten at "the place that YHWH your God will choose"; TS simply dispenses with the historical fiction. Finally, the phrase "והלכת באלהיך יבחר" is virtually synonymous with"ופנית לאהליך והלכת" aside from the change to the third-person plural. Indeed, one wonders why the author of TS bothered to rephrase this clause at all. That the author of TS feels free to rephrase the pentateuchal text even when clearly referring to a specific verse is a revealing sign of his independent stance towards Scripture.

\[322\] An appropriate move, given that TS contains instructions for building the Temple!
The prescriptions for the adjacent festival of Mazzot (17:11–16) are somewhat more closely tied to the wording of the corresponding pentateuchal legislation. Yet the author of TS has streamlined the text, mainly by using *moderate rearrangements* with a few *minor omissions*. The first sentence (17:10–12) combines Lev 23:6–7 (//Num 28:17–18) into a single statement:

**TABLE 6.2**

**MODIFICATION OF LEV 23:6–7 IN TS 17:10–12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lev 23:6–7</th>
<th>TS 17:10–12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ובחמותה عشر יום לחדש הזה</td>
<td>ובחמותה عشر יום לחדש הזה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ו gerekti לחדש ימים שבעת מצות חנוכ</td>
<td>קורא קדש בו תעשו לוא עבודה מלאכת כל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בות אל שאין חנוכ</td>
<td>ו fscanf ימים שבעת מצות חנוכ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*And on the fifteenth day of this month, the festival of mazzot for YHWH. Seven days you shall eat mazzot. On the first day you shall have a holy convocation; you shall not do any laborious work.*

*And on the fifteenth of this month is a holy convocation; you shall not do any laborious work on it, a festival of mazzot, seven days, for YHWH.*

In TS, all mention of eating unleavened bread is dropped. That omission, along with some minor rearrangement, creates a clause, וпочת שבעת ימים ליהוה, that is virtually identical to Lev 23:34bβ, וпочת שבעת ימים ליהוה, “the festival of Sukkot, seven days to YHWH.” This correspondence can hardly be coincidental; it appears that

286
the author of TS here made at least a small attempt to coordinate the language used to describe the two festivals.\textsuperscript{323}

For the enumeration of the sacrifices, TS turns to the only source that lists them, Numbers 28. Lines 12–13 basically parallel Num 28:19:

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
\textbf{Num 28:19} & \textbf{TS 17:12–13} \\
\hline
והקרבתם & והקרבתם בבלל יום וימם ושבעת ימים האלאלה
אשע עללהוה & עללה ליהוה
פרים בני בקר שני ואיל אחד & פרים שני ואיל
ושבעה כבשים בני שנהTodd unblemished ויהי לכם & ושבעה ימים לכלב
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\begin{flushleft}
And you shall offer
an offering by fire,  \\
an burnt offering to YHWH,  \\
two bulls of the flock, one ram
and seven lambs a year old, unblemished
shall they be for you
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
And you shall offer
on every day for these seven days
a burnt offering to YHWH,  \\
two bulls, a ram,
and seven lambs a year old, unblemished
\end{flushleft}

Again, aside from some minor omissions, the major difference between TS and Num 28:19 is due to a rearrangement, in this case somewhat paraphrastic: the clause \textit{בכל} הימים \textit{לשבעת} ו\textit{יום} \textit{יום} reflects the first half of Num 28:24a, \textit{האלאלה תעשו יום יום ושבעת ימים האלאלה} 12(י)ים, “You shall offer the same as these each day (for) (the) seven days.”\textsuperscript{324}

Lines 14–15 continue with information regarding the sacrifices:

\\textsuperscript{323} Unfortunately, the corresponding portion of TS’s Sukkot law is missing, in the lacuna at the top of col. 28.

\textsuperscript{324} MT reads \textit{שבעת ימים}, but SP G have \textit{שבעת עלים}. 287
“and one male goat for a purification offering, and their grain offering and their drink offering, [according to the ordinance] for the bulls and for the rams and for the lambs and for the goat.”

This formulation diverges substantially from that of Num 28:20–23, which first lists the required grain offerings for the bulls, ram, and lambs (vv. 20–21; no drink offering is mentioned), then prescribes the goat for the purification offering (v. 22), and then notes that all this should be offered in addition to the regular morning tamid sacrifice (v. 23). TS drops this last bit of information altogether. The differences between lines 14–15 and Num 28:20–22, on the other hand, reflect standard formulations that the author of TS uses throughout the Scroll when prescribing a list of sacrifices. In other words, TS always differs from the festival calendar in Numbers 28–29 in the same ways as it does here: the purification offering is always moved up before the mention of the grain and drink offerings, and the grain and drink offerings are rarely enumerated but are usually referred to with this same short formula.325

After the sacrificial prescriptions, TS concludes its legislation for Mazzot in lines 15–16 with

“And on the seventh day is an [assembly] for YHWH; you shall not do any laborious work upon it.”

325 The earlier mention of the purification offering is due to the author’s conviction that the goat sacrificed as a purification offering also requires a grain and drink offering. For discussion, see Yadin, Temple Scroll, 1.143-46; Eyal Regev, “The Sectarian Controversies about the Cereal Offerings,” DSD 5 (1998): 33-56, at pp. 34-36. The full amounts for the grain and drink offerings are stipulated for Rosh Hodesh and for the first day of the first month (both in col. 14), and apparently for the Waving of the Sheaf (col. 18). Otherwise the shorter formulation with כמשפט appears to be the norm; see the legislation for the Feast of Ordination (col. 15), Firstfruits of Wheat (col. 19), Firstfruits of Wine (col. 20), Firstfruits of Oil (col. 22), Rosh Hashanah (col. 25), the Day of Atonement (col. 25), and Sukkot (cols 28–29).
Yadin argues that the phrase קדש מקרא of Lev 23:8 will not fit in the lacuna at the beginning of line 16, so he reconstructs עצרת in light of Deut 16:8bα, עצרת והשביעי,halb, ‘and on the seventh day is an assembly for YHWH your God.’ The presence of אלהי, which occurs in Deut 16:8 but not in Lev 23:8, and never occurs in the Hebrew Bible after the phrase מקרא, supports Yadin’s suggestion. If this reading is correct, it is striking, because it means that, even though TS focuses on the sacrifices for the festival of Mazzot, which Deuteronomy never considers, and completely ignores the eating of unleavened bread that is the focus of Deuteronomy’s version, the author has still incorporated terminology from Deuteronomy, suggesting that he regarded his version as a summary or combination of all the pentateuchal laws on Pesach and Mazzot. Faced with an overabundance of pentateuchal material, the author carefully constructed a single, unified law, built largely out of snippets or paraphrases of the scriptural text, but also incorporating clarificatory additions and the author’s own standard formulations.

6.4 Passage Four: Extending a Pattern (TS 66:11–16)

This passage presents an intriguing case of the grouping of similar laws. Having followed the sequence of Deuteronomy without major changes for several columns, TS logically proceeds on from Deut 22:24–29 in the beginning of col. 66 to Deut 23:1 in lines 11–12. Deut 23:1 contains a law pertaining to improper sexual relationships: לא יקח

326 Num 28:25 is almost exactly parallel to Lev 23:8. It, like TS, begins with the copula (/comment...) The only other difference is that the Numbers verse reads ... מקרא קדש ה' ל_people...
A man shall not take the wife of his father; he shall not uncover his father’s skirt.” In the context of Deuteronomy 23, this law is somewhat isolated, followed not by other laws governing sexual relationships but by laws prohibiting a variety of persons from entering the “assembly of YHWH” (23:2–9). The author of TS, on the other hand, chooses Deut 23:1 as a sort of gathering point for other laws governing sexual relationships. The pentateuchal incest material is rearranged in that some of the laws originally found in Leviticus 18 and 20 are now located here in the context of Deuteronomy. However, the author does not simply move the laws to a new setting. He also rewords them so that they match the pattern of Deut 23:1. For example, TS 66:12–13 prohibits a man from having sexual relations with his brother’s wife. In Leviticus, this prohibition is found in 18:16, “You shall not uncover the nakedness of your brother’s wife; it is your brother’s nakedness,” and 20:21, “If a man takes his brother’s wife, it is impurity; he has uncovered the nakedness of his brother; they shall be childless.” In the first case, the law is phrased as a second-person apodictic command (“You shall not…”); in the second, as a casuistic case (“If a man…”). In TS, the law is given the same structure as Deut 23:1:

TS 66:12–13: "לָא יַקְחֶנָה אָישׁ אָשֶׁת אָביו לָא נִלַּנְהָ נְנוֹק אָבִיו נְנוֹק אָבִיו נְנוֹק אָבִיו נְנוֹק אָבִיו נְנוֹק אָבִיו נְנוֹק אָבִיו נְנוֹק אָבִיו נְנוֹק אָבִיו נְנוֹק אָבִיו נְנוֹק אָבִיו נְנוֹק אָבִיו נְנוֹק אָבִיו נְנוֹק אָבִיו נְנוֹק אָבִיו נְנוֹק אָבִיו נְנוֹק אָבִיו נְנוֹק אָבִיו נְנוֹק אָבִיו נְנוֹק אָבִיו נְנוֹק אָבִיו נְנוֹק אָבִיו נְנוֹק אָבִיו נְנוֹק אָבִיו נְנוֹק אָבִי
“A man shall not take the wife of his brother; he shall not uncover his brother’s skirt, the son of his father or the son of his mother, for it is impurity.”

The new version retains key terminology of the old (e.g., the identification of the act as נדה, “impurity”), and even adds a clarificatory clause based on the following law
(“his father’s son or his mother’s son”; see line 14), but it is obvious that the law has been restructured according to the pattern of Deut 23:1.

The same procedure is followed for the subsequent laws, prohibiting sexual relations of a man and his sister (66:14 // Lev 18:9; 20:17), a man and his aunt (66:15 // Lev 18:12–13; 20:19), and a man and his niece (66:16, non-pentateuchal). All three begin just as Deut 23:1 does, ..." A man shall not take...” In the first two cases, this formulation replaces an original casuistic or second-person apodictic command. The third case is notable because it contains a law not found in the Pentateuch; it, too, is constructed according to the model of Deut 23:1.

This chain of laws represents a more extended example of a phenomenon already observed above, in TS 52:4–5, 13, where a new law and an existing law were reformulated in light of the structure of a particular verse (in that case, Deut 17:1: ...). Here we have numerous laws moved from their original setting and restructured to match the formulation of the particular verse that is made the head of the series. In terms of compositional technique, these reformulated laws are best

327 Three laws from Leviticus are extant in col. 66, the fourth (uncle-niece relations) being non-pentateuchal. However, the last preserved words of col. 66, ... אתי, suggest that more laws followed on col. 67, the last column of this copy of TS, which contains no extant writing. Yadin posits that this final column could have contained no more than 5–6 inscribed lines; Yadin, Temple Scroll, 2.300-1. Confirmation that these lines did indeed contain additional laws on prohibited marriages is provided by 4Q524, the earliest preserved copy of TS. Although it is very fragmentary, 4Q524 clearly overlaps with the material in col. 66 of 11QTb and continues further, containing several more laws concerning proscribed marriages and then the law for Levirite marriage (Deut 25:5–10). Puech construes the additional laws as corresponding to Lev 18:10; 18:15/20:12; 18:17 cf. 20:14; 18:18, and has reconstructed the same introductory formula for them all, ... אתי; see Emile Puech, Qumran Grotte 4, XVIII: Textes Hébreux (DJD 25; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 103-7. Although none of these opening formulae have been preserved in the section of 4Q524 that goes beyond the preserved text of 11QTa, there is no reason to think the additional laws would have been formulated any differently.

As Schiffman notes, the evidence of 4Q524 suggests that 11QTa represents an incomplete copy of TS, or possibly a different recension of TS, although this may be less likely given the later date of 11QTa.
considered *paraphrases*, since they reflect the content of the original laws, but in different words. The author of TS has used rearrangement and paraphrase (along with a few minor additions and other small-scale changes) to replace the diverse and repetitive laws of the Pentateuch with an orderly and consistent paragraph on prohibited sexual relations.

6.5 Passage Five: The Composition of New Law (TS 21:12–23:01)

Although I have already mentioned above several cases where TS presents completely new legislation, these laws were relatively brief. TS also contains whole passages for which there is no parallel at all in Hebrew Scripture, such as the legislation for the festivals of the Firstfruits of Wine and Oil in the Scroll’s festival calendar, the instructions for the courts and various structures associated with the Temple, many of the Scroll’s purity laws, and the extensive Law of the King. All of this material is technically “new” or non-pentateuchal, since its content is not reflected in the Pentateuch. Unsurprisingly, then, the wording of much of this material is the author’s own composition. Yet in many cases these new passages show some relation to the text of the Pentateuch, either through the use of vocabulary characteristic of a particular part of the Pentateuch, or through reuse of specific verses or groups of verses. In my discussion of this final passage, the Scroll’s legislation for the non-biblical festival of the Firstfruits of Oil, I want to point out the variety of ways the author of TS drew upon pentateuchal language in his composition of new law.

The Scroll’s legislation on the Firstfruits of Oil begins as follows (TS 21:12–14):

12 And [you] shall count [for yourself] seven weeks; seven times; forty-nine days; there shall be seven complete weeks; until the day after the seventh Sabbath you shall count, fifty days.

The (single-)underlined portions of the above text correspond exactly to Lev 23:15–16a, the pentateuchal command to count fifty days from the waving of the ‘omer before bringing a “new grain-offering” to the altar:

And you shall count for yourselves from the day after the Sabbath; from the day when you bring the ‘omer of the wave-offering; there shall be seven complete weeks; until the day after the seventh Sabbath you shall count, fifty days.”

The author has made three separate modifications. First, he removes the specific temporal reference that no longer applies in the new context, replacing Leviticus’s "from this day" with "from this day." Second, he adds the phrase, “seven weeks” (double-underlined), taken from the parallel law in Deut 16:9. Third, he adds the further clarifications, “seven times; forty-nine days.” But these modifications are relatively minor compared to

328 In the new context, the “this day” in question is the day of the festival of Firstfruits of Wine, which itself is held fifty days after the festival of Firstfruits of Wheat, the pentateuchal Weeks/Firstfruits.

329 This phrase is also inserted into the introduction to the laws for Firstfruits of Wine, which similarly draws upon Lev 23:15 (TS 19:11–13). However, the incorporation of the deuteronomistic phrase does not occur in the legislation for Firstfruits of Wheat (the section of TS that actually describes the same festival as Lev 23:15 does).
the near-verbatim reuse of Lev 23:15–16a. It is important to note that, in this type of *addition of material from elsewhere*, the words, though largely the same, have a new referent: no longer do they refer to counting fifty days from the raising of the sheaf, but from the festival of Firstfruits of Wine.

The reapplication of Leviticus 23 continues in the remainder of line 14, but TS then moves quickly away from that source and into details specific to the new festival:

```
("You shall offer a new grain-offering to YHWH; from your dwelling-places you shall bring two loaves as a wave-offering"
```

 Lev 23:16b–17a, "You shall offer a new grain-offering to YHWH; from your dwelling-places you shall bring two loaves as a wave-offering"

TS 21:14–15, "You shall offer new oil from the dwelling-places of the tribes of the children of Israel."

The wording of the details that follow cannot be traced to any specific pentateuchal source(s):

```
["You shall offer new oil from the dwelling-places of the tribes of the children of Israel.
```

TS 21:15–16, "You shall offer new oil from the dwelling-places of the tribes of the children of Israel.

The word כתית was certainly used because of the cultic purposes envisioned for the new oil—the oil used in the sanctuary’s lamps and the oil mixed with the daily grain-offering is described in the Pentateuch as כתית—but the collocation חדש שמן occurs nowhere in the Hebrew Bible. Interestingly, however, the Scroll seems to revert once again to Leviticus 23 in the last words of col. 21: "firstfruits before YHWH"

330 The oil burnt in the lamps is called שמן זך זית שמן, “pure beaten olive-oil” in Exod 27:20; Lev 24:2; the oil for the grain-offering accompanying the morning Tamid is שמן חית שמן, “beaten oil,” according to Exod 29:40; Num 28:5. See Yadin, Temple Scroll, 1.112.
YHWH,” corresponds to Lev 23:17b, הבכורים ליהוה, “firstfruits for YHWH.” In a way, TS 21:12–16 can be viewed as completely rooted in Lev 23:15–17, with all of the changes simply reflecting the new context: legislation for Firstfruits of Oil as opposed to Firstfruits of Wheat (= biblical Shavuot). Further evidence that the mention of הבכורים constitutes a deliberate reference to Lev 23:17b is that TS then appears to move on to the sacrificial prescriptions for the day, just as H does in Lev 23:18 (ותקרבתם על הלحم סבעה, הבכורים, “And you shall offer along with the loaves seven lambs…”).

The first few lines of col. 22 are very fragmentarily preserved, but it is clear that they begin to discuss the animal sacrifices required for the festival. The isolated phrases that remain are all relatively consistent with the language used by the pentateuchal sources P and H to describe sacrificial procedure, but they show varying degrees of connection with specific verses. What remains of line 02 is among the more traceable phrases, since only a few verses in the Pentateuch describe the priest making atonement for the whole congregation.

TS 22:02 כפו [לפני העדה כל על בו ר], “[he will make expiation with it on behalf of the whole congregation before[”

Num 15:25 is the closest in formulation to the reading in TS: וכרה הכהן על כל עדת בני ישראל וסלח, “The priest shall make expiation on behalf of the whole congregation of the children of Israel, and they shall be forgiven.”

331 The lines numbered 22:01–05 are not preserved at all in 11QTא. However, 11QTב has preserved some of the contents of these lines. 11QTא is partially extant beginning in line 1, but 11QTב continues to provide additional readings through line 5. For the combined text, see Yadin, Temple Scroll, 2.98-99.

332 See also Lev 16:33, וכרה הכהנים על כל עדת בני ישראל וסלח, “on behalf of the priests and the whole people of the assembly he shall make expiation”; and Lev 4:20, וכרה עליהם הכהן וסלח להם, “and the priest shall make expiation on their behalf and they shall be forgiven.”
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It is somewhat difficult to judge the significance of this parallel, however: the words involved are not uncommon, and it does not seem impossible that the author of TS might have used them independently of any biblical verse. On the other hand, if there is a deliberate reference here to Num 15:25, it would constitute another sign of the author’s connection of related passages and general habit of reading the Torah in light of itself. Normally in the priestly festival calendars, atonement is mentioned only very briefly, typically in the form of reference to the standard purification offering, e.g. חטאת ושעיר עליכם, “and one goat for a purification offering, to effect expiation on your behalf” (Num 28:22). It is unclear what animal is referred to by בו in TS 22:02, but undoubtedly that animal is offered as a purification offering. Since the purification offerings in the pentateuchal festival calendars do effect expiation for the entire community (עליכם), it is perhaps not strange that the author of TS would formulate reference to that expiation in light of the pentateuchal prescriptions for the purification offering sacrificed on behalf of the whole congregation (Num 15:24–26).

There is nothing particularly pentateuchal about what remains in line 03, בשמן הוהי, “with this oil, half a hin.” Half a hin of oil is the amount that should be mixed into the grain offering for a bull according to Num 15:9—a fact that causes Yadin to surmise that the purification offering mentioned in line 02 is a bull—but Numbers always uses the word חצי, not מחצית, for “half,” and the phrase בשמן הוהי must refer back to the new oil brought by the tribes according to 21:15. The remains of line 04, however, have more pentateuchal precedent:
TS 22:04: “according to the ordinance, it is a burnt offering, an offering by fire, an odor[…”

The string נחוח ריח אשה הוא עולה occurs in Lev 1:13, 17, referring to a goat or bird offered as a whole burnt offering (עלה). But if Yadin is correct and lines 02–05 refer to a purification offering (as line 02 makes likely), then the string has been radically reapplied, referring no longer to an עולה at all, but to those parts of the purification offering (חטאת) that were burnt upon the altar (the fat and the accompanying grain and drink offerings, according to TS). In the Pentateuch, the phrase עולה always refers to an actual whole burnt offering (Exod 29:18; Lev 1:13, 17; 8:21). It seems, therefore, that the author has taken a pentateuchal phrase familiar to him and used it in a new situation that was (presumably) deemed analogous. Finally, the phrase直升机 והיוו בנרות, “this oil they shall light in the lamps,” in lines 05–1 has no biblical antecedent. 2 Chronicles twice uses the root בער with נרות (4:20; 13:11), but there is D, not H, and the נרות themselves are the object of the verb (whereas here, contra Yadin, the oil must be the object of יבעירו). 334

Continuing with sacrificial prescriptions in line 2, the Scroll mentions שרי האלפים... “the commanders of thousands along with the princes of…” The “commanders of thousands” appear as military personnel in the Pentateuch (see e.g. Numbers 31), while the נשיאים, “princes, leaders,” are envisioned as civil authorities or

333 Note that TS similarly uses the phrase עולהхожאת to refer to the fat, grain offering, and drink offering of the purification offering in 16:10.

334 In no stem would בער normally take ב to mark the object. Yadin’s interpretation of the clause may have influenced his citation of the examples from 2 Chronicles as parallel formulations. See Yadin, Temple Scroll, 2.99.
clan leaders (see e.g. Num 1:16). Their appearance here in the context of sacrificial prescriptions therefore departs from the usual conception of the Pentateuch: the author of TS apparently envisions them acting as representatives of their respective tribes in those rites which require each tribe to bring a contribution to the altar. 335 This view is probably based on Numbers 7, where the נשיאי ישראל, one per tribe, bring offerings to the newly-completed Tabernacle. TS has extended this one-time role into a permanent, annual responsibility.

More sacrificial animals are mentioned in lines 3–4:

TS 22:3–4 כבשי[ב] [שנה] ארבך עשר ו맨חתמה ונסכמה[นะים] ונסכמה עשר ארבעה, ו produkt דם האלילים, ל[אלהים], "lamb[s] a [year old], fourteen, and their grain offering and their drink offering[ ... and] for the rams."

Fourteen lambs are to be offered every day of the festival of Sukkot according to Numbers 29, but succeeding lines will make clear that TS stipulates fourteen lambs and fourteen rams—a number never prescribed in Scripture. The mention of the grain and drink offerings matches the standard formulation of TS, “and their grain offering and their drink offering according to the ordinance for the [animal 1]s and the [animal 2]s and the [animal 3]s”; see e.g. 17:14–15; 20:04–05; 25:14–15.

The actual procedure for the sacrifice of these animals is delineated next, after an interval (TS 22:4–8). The first words of the new section, "The sons of Levi shall slaughter the…," are striking because Levites are never portrayed as slaughtering sacrifices in the Pentateuch. The new role is part of a general elevation of

335 The נשיאי ישראל occur in the same position in col. 21, in the legislation for the Firstfruits of Wine, where their exact role is similarly unclear. Col. 21 also mentions the נשיאי הדגלים, “the princes of the ‘standards’,” who drink the new wine after the priests and Levites but before all the rest of the people.
the status of the Levites throughout the Scroll, as Jacob Milgrom has pointed out.\[1\] The disposal of the blood, however, remains the purview of the priests:

TS 22:5 ...] "and the priests, the sons of Aaron, shall sprinkle their blood […]"

Here TS seems to draw on a specific pentateuchal source: only two verses contain זורקו + כהנים + אהרן + בני, Lev 1:11 and Lev 3:2 (though both have the latter two elements in a sequence different from that of TS, ובני אהרן וכהנים). Since Lev 3:2 refers to the offering of well-being (והב שלמים), the type of sacrifice at issue here, it seems likely that the author of TS drew on that verse. More precisely, he probably drew on Lev 3:8, 13, which refer to the disposal of blood from a sheep or goat offered as a הב שלמים וורק + בני אהרן וכהנים, without the word כהנים. Consciously or unconsciously, the author employed the longer formulation instead.

With line 6 a direct source is no longer easily identifiable. Whereas the prescriptions for the הב שלמים in Leviticus 3 list in detail the various fatty parts to be removed from the animal, TS simply summarizes:

TS 22:6 "and their fat they shall turn to smoke upon the altar of [burnt offering]."

A similar summary occurs throughout Leviticus 4, where at first the fat to be removed from the purification offering is delineated (vv. 8–9) but thereafter the summary statement is used יא והב כל הקטיר ומובא וה▌, “and all its fat he [the priest] shall turn to smoke on the altar” (e.g. 4:26). It may be that the author of TS had such summaries in

mind; the *casus pendens* structure common to TS and Lev 4:26, whereby the object precedes the verb, may be evidence of a direct connection. On the other hand, there are some differences in the formulation, and it may be that the author simply drew on his knowledge of priestly idiom to compose the sentence.

Not even a potential source can be found for the formulation in the next line:

**TS 22:7**

“[and their grain offering] and their drink offering they shall turn to smoke upon the fats”

Although the prescriptions for the grain offering in Leviticus 2 stipulate that a portion of it is to be burned upon the altar, instructions for animal sacrifice accompanied by a grain and drink offering do not indicate what is to be done with them: it is never stated that they are to be placed upon the fats removed from the animal. There is a partial conceptual parallel in Lev 8:26, the account of Aaron’s ordination as high priest, where Moses takes various baked goods, places them upon the fats and upon the right thigh,” puts all this in Aaron’s hands to be elevated, and then burns the lot. However, the parallel is limited: the cakes taken from the basket of unleavened bread” are not an ordinary grain offering, and there is little overlap in formulation. It seems better to view TS’s wording in this case as independent.

Line 8 begins with the tail end of a standard priestly phrase—*אשיש רוח* נוהת—*לயוה*—that is used so often in P that its presence here cannot be traced to any particular verse, and probably just reflects the author’s familiarity with the formulaic language of sacrificial texts. Thereafter, TS continues with several lines on portions of the sacrifices that are to be given to the priests and Levites. Before a long lacuna at the end of line 8, we read [*ומירימו נון*], “and they shall lift up fr[om . . .], a verb not normally associated in the
Bible with the priestly prebends. The text continues on line 9 with אַת שָׁם הָבִין אַתְךָ הָיָה תַּנּוּפָה, “the right thigh and the breast of the wave-offering.” These priestly portions are familiar from e.g. Lev 7:31–32; 10:14–15. The usual way of referring to them as a pair is חָזַי ואַת הָיָה תַּנּוּפָה וָשְׁקוֹן תַּנּוּפָה (Ex 29:27; Lev 7:34; 10:14; Num 6:20; cf. Lev 10:15). The combination התנופה חזה + הוֹזָחַי+ הוֹזָשְׁקָון occurs only once, in Num 18:18, where, however, the meat of firstborn animals is compared to the breast and thigh as another portion due the priests (וֹשֵׁרְמֵיהֶנֶֽךָ לְפָּחוֹת הָתַנּוּפָה וָשְׁקָנּוֹת תַּנּוּפָה לְךָ). Since it is hard to understand why this particular verse, as opposed to others that discuss the priestly portions more directly, would have served as a model for TS, I would rather regard TS’s formulation as an independent use of familiar priestly terminology.

The situation is different in the rest of line 9 and line 10:

TS 22:9–10 הלַמְּנָה יִהְיֶה לְכֹהֲנִים הקְבָה וְאַת הָלֲחָיִים וְאַת [וְלָאָרֶשְׁט] יִהְיֶה לְכֹהֲנִים תַּנּוּפָה יִהְיֶה לְכֹהֲנִים, “and as a reshit, [the foreleg,] the cheeks, and the maw shall belong to the priests as a portion, according to their ordinance.”

Cf. Deut 18:3 וּןָתִן שֵׁם שָׁם הָאֲם שָׁם הַזָּבֹח הַזָּבֹח מֵאַת הַעֲם מֵאַת הַכֹּהֲנִים מֵשָּׁמְעַת יִהְיֶה וּזְהַזְהָב לְכֹהֲנִים, “This shall be the priests’ right from the people, from those who sacrifice, be it an ox or a sheep: they shall give to the priest the foreleg and the cheeks and the maw.”

Here a reference to Deut 18:3 is unavoidable, as this is the only verse in the Pentateuch that mentions the foreleg, cheeks, and maw; the further overlap in the words הלַמְּנָה and יִהְיֶה point to deliberate reuse. Besides הלַמְּנָה, the sense of which is unclear,337 the only word in this sentence that does not stem from Deut 18:3 is לְמַה, “as a

---

337 Yadin thinks it means that the foreleg, cheeks, and maw are only included in the priestly portion, and the shoulder only assigned to the Levites (see below), when they come from animals sacrificed as part of a firstfruits festival, as is the case here. Milgrom rejects this view, noting that TS 60:7 also
portion.” As this term is used to describe the right thigh in Lev 7:33; 8:29//Exod 29:26, it seems evident that the author of TS was attempting to unify the opinions of two sources (deuteronomic and priestly) on the subject of the priestly prebends, reading them together to deduce that the foreleg, cheeks, and maw, as well as the right thigh and the breast, were due to the priests from every sacrifice of well-being.338

The next phrase, הולאיהים את השכס (“and for the Levites, the shoulder”; lines 10–11), represents a major departure from pentateuchal law, where the Levites are given the tithes (Num 18:21) but no sacrificial portions. The decision that the Levites should have a share in the sacrificial portions appears to have been exegetically based on Deut 18:1, which states that “the whole tribe of Levi” shall have sacrificial offerings (יהוה אשי) as a portion.339 The reason for assigning specifically the shoulder to the Levites is somewhat less clear; Milgrom makes a persuasive argument that it is based on longstanding unclarity about the definition of the foreleg (זרוע).340

The bulk of lines 11–13 instructs that, after the priestly and levitical portions have been removed, the meat of the sacrifices shall be apportioned to the people, with one ram and one lamb going to each tribe, plus one of each for the priests and one of each for the Levites (hence the conclusion earlier that fourteen rams must have been mentioned assigns the shoulder to the Levites, without any restriction on the sacrifice from which it derives. Unfortunately, however, Milgrom does not indicate clearly how he would interpret וראשית in 22:9; he implies that perhaps it refers to the “choice” or “best” portions and is not related to firstfruits at all. See Yadin, Temple Scroll, 1.154; Milgrom, "Studies," 505-6.

338 Thus I agree with Milgrom’s interpretation contra Yadin; see previous note.


alongside the fourteen lambs in lines 2–3). As far as I can see, these lines contain no reference or allusion to any scriptural text. That changes in the next sentence:

TS 22:13–14

“And they shall eat them on this day in the outer court, before YHWH, eternal statutes for their generations, year by year.”

Several overlaps in phraseology point to Deut 15:20a:

“Before YHWH your God you shall eat it, year by year, in the place which YHWH will choose.”

This verse refers to the consumption of firstborn livestock, thus forming a parallel, albeit an inexact one, with the situation in TS, which describes consumption of the sacrifices offered in conjunction with the Firstfruits of Oil. Besides rearranging the elements of his source, the author of TS inserted several additional elements. The first two relate to the context of this prescription in the Scroll: with הזה the author reminds that this is now an annual festival with a specific date in the calendar. The note החיצונה explicitly locates the festivities in TS’s new Temple, once again undoing Deuteronomy’s putative pre-conquest setting, as we saw in the Passover law above. The final insertion, חוקות עלול לזרותיהם, reflects of course a standard priestly formulation, but one that is especially prominent in the Festival Calendar in Leviticus 23 (vv. 14, 21, 31, 41). It may therefore have been included as part of an effort (seen also

341 TS appears to follow the 364-day calendar familiar from Jubilees and other Qumran documents. Since 364 is exactly divisible by 7, in this calendar every festival occurs on the same date and day of the week every year. See Yadin, Temple Scroll, 1.116-19; VanderKam, Calendars, 65-69.

342 On the outer court in TS, see Yadin, Temple Scroll, 1.249-75.

343 The plural form חוקות, however, does not appear in the Pentateuch, though it does appear eight times in the Hebrew Bible (mostly in Jeremiah and Ezekiel). If the plural form has any significance here, it is not clear to me.
in the use of biblical verses more generally) to tie this non-scriptural feast more firmly into the series of annual festivals as envisioned in Scripture.

From the last word of line 14 through most of line 16, the Scroll prescribes that the people should anoint themselves with the new oil and eat olives from the new harvest, “for on that day they shall atone on all the oil of the land before YHWH, one time per year.” There is no real evidence here of any dependence on pentateuchal language. The only possible exception is the final phrase, “before YHWH once a year.” This is vaguely reminiscent of the formula closing the list of festivals in the Covenant Code, although the lack of a more sustained parallel makes this suggestion highly uncertain.

Exod 23:17, שלוש פעמים בשנה יראה כל זכור אל פני יהוה, “Three times a year each of your males shall appear before the lord YHWH”

Finally our long march brings us to the last extant words pertaining to the festival of Firstfruits of Oil:

TS 22:16–23:01, וישמחו כל בני ישראל במשבותיהם, “And all the children of Israel shall rejoice in all [their dwelling-places(?)”

The idea of “rejoicing” at a festival or sacrifice is found in the Pentateuch almost exclusively in Deuteronomy (although see also Lev 23:40, on Sukkot). All the pentateuchal instances, however, are phrased in the second person (“you shall rejoice…”). The author of TS has once again taken over a familiar idiom (in this case deuteronomic) and redeployed it in a new framework (here, third person instead of second, and applied to a new festival). If Yadin’s reconstruction is correct and TS continued with typical priestly language (משבות), then this is another instance of TS integrating the characteristic language of the various pentateuchal sources.
This detailed examination of the laws for the festival of Firstfruits of Oil has been lengthy, but I hope that it has served to illustrate the complexity of characterizing TS’s reuse of pentateuchal material in sections that essentially represent new composition. The text ranges from near-verbatim reuse of a specific verse or verses through to totally independent composition that shows no hint of any scriptural model. In between, the author may deploy a specific verse in a rearranged or otherwise reworked fashion, or may use language specific to a particular pentateuchal source without appearing to draw on any one verse. Obviously, the degree of engagement with scriptural texts depends to some extent on whether there is a scriptural parallel for what the author wished to say. On the other hand, this entire block of legislation refers to a festival that does not exist in the Pentateuch, making almost every use of pentateuchal material in a sense analogical.

There are two ways to look at the author’s procedure in composing passages such as this. On the one hand, it is striking that so much of the author’s language, even in composing new law, is based in some way upon existing scriptural texts. On the other hand, in the framework of my larger study it is important to recognize that there is no indication that the author of TS felt in any way constrained to use scriptural language or to adhere strictly to existing models: when there was no precedent for what he needed to say, he went ahead and said it in what appear to be his own words. The Scroll’s very deep engagement with and redeployment of the text of the Torah serves a vital purpose in that it supports and enhances the Scroll’s claim to itself represent Sinaitic Torah.344 However,

the author is not chained to what already exists: he is free simply to compose new law when necessary.

6.6 Compositional Technique in TS and the 4QRP Mss

The foregoing detailed analysis of five passages from TS has provided some indication of the variety of ways in which its author reworked the pentateuchal text. The question now becomes how those compositional techniques compare to those identified in 4Q158 and the other 4QRP mss. The reader of the preceding discussion will have noticed many points of similarity, but also some considerable differences. I submit that many of the differences are less matters of the use of different techniques than matters of the application of the same techniques to different types of texts and with different goals.

6.6.1 Minor Changes

The first passage discussed in this chapter exemplified sections of TS which reproduce pentateuchal text with only very minor changes. Other passages, especially Passage 2, also contain many minor changes. Such small changes, as previous chapters have indicated, are likewise frequent in the 4QRP mss. Overlaps can also be identified in the goal implied by the changes; for example, as in TS, minor alterations in the 4QRP mss can function to smooth out the syntax of a given clause. (In Passage 1, TS 63:2, we may also see a minor omission functioning in that same way, a phenomenon not attested in the 4QRP mss.) Other minor alterations and additions from elsewhere serve to harmonize formulations to those of parallel or neighboring verses. Modifications for this purpose, as we saw, are very common in SP and also are occasionally preserved in the
4QRP mss. At this point, it is unsurprising that we should encounter small changes of various types in TS, since they occur in every text we have examined. The only noteworthy aspect of small changes in TS is how frequently minor omissions occur: clear examples of omission are very infrequent in both the 4QRP mss and SP. 345

6.6.2 Paraphrase/Unification of Parallel Laws

Several instances in the passages discussed above illustrate that the author of TS excelled at paraphrase. For instance, Deuteronomy 12 is paraphrased in TS 52:13–16: it is heavily condensed, reworded, supplemented with points important to the author, and combined with material from Leviticus 17. The Passover law of col. 17 represents a paraphrastic combination of the pentateuchal laws on the subject. In col. 66, the laws on prohibited sexual relations from Leviticus 18 and 20 are paraphrased in that they are restated to conform to the textual model provided by Deut 23:1.

Although the fragmentary preservation of the 4QRP mss often makes precise classification difficult, in the preceding chapters I have mentioned some examples of apparent paraphrase in those texts as well. Several of these examples are small in scope (ca. one line), and thus are not particularly similar to the more extensive paraphrases of TS (e.g. 4Q158 4 4; 4Q364 24 8). One or two, however, are more comparable. Especially pertinent here is 4Q158 frag. 14, which appears to be a paraphrase of portions of Exodus 6, with material included from Exodus 15; it is thus analogous to the combination of

345 For omission in the passages I have discussed, see e.g. TS 17:10–12; 52:9; 63:2.
Deuteronomy 12 and Leviticus 17 in TS col. 52. The possible combination of Numbers 21 and Deuteronomy 2 in 4Q365 37 could also be adduced.

Analogues thus exist in the 4QRP mss to TS’s use of paraphrase; however, there is one particular purpose for which TS employs this technique that is without parallel in the 4QRP mss. As my reference to the Passover laws of col. 17 implies, TS regularly uses paraphrase to combine all or several of the pentateuchal laws on a given topic into a single law. In practice, this means replacing a whole panoply of scriptural laws (at least in the case of Passover it is a panoply!) with one. Another excellent example of this procedure, though too lengthy to discuss in detail, is the law for the Day of Atonement in TS (25:10–27:10), in which the pertinent material from Leviticus 16, Leviticus 23, and Numbers 29 is skillfully woven together.\footnote{On the Day of Atonement in TS, see Lawrence H. Schiffman, "The Case of the Day of Atonement Ritual," in Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls (eds. Michael E. Stone and Esther G. Chazon; STDJ 28; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 181-88.} This practice in TS has been referred to as “conflation,” a descriptor that makes a good deal of sense.\footnote{See especially Kaufman, "Temple Scroll." Yadin speaks of “unifying duplicate commands”; Yadin, Temple Scroll, 1.74.} However, I believe it is not far off the mark to consider this activity a type of paraphrase as well, since through the combination into a single law the basic content of each of the sources is reflected, but in different wording. Furthermore, we have seen in the case of the Passover law that TS does not simply stitch together pentateuchal passages, but rephrases and adds new elements as well: the unified whole reflects the sources, but is not limited to them for its material. In any case, it is worthy of note that this use of paraphrase does not appear in the 4QRP mss. While we have seen that those mss sometimes use paraphrase to introduce
one source into another—and interestingly, both possible cases of this involve parallel narratives—nowhere is paraphrase used to unite parallel laws. In fact, a striking contrast to TS is evident in the one clear instance of reworking of the festival legislation in the 4QRP mss: in 4Q366 4, Deut 16:13–14 is located after Num 29:32–30:1, thus bringing into proximity two laws on the festival of Sukkot. On the face of it this move appears similar to the topical arrangement of law in TS. However, TS does not simply juxtapose laws that pertain to the same subject, but rather reworks them into a single law. Laws on the same general topic may be brought together (like the sacrificial laws in col. 52 or the incest laws in col. 66), but laws that are truly parallel are combined. It is possible that the editor of 4Q366 did not perceive the two Sukkot laws as parallel: after all, the priestly laws pertain almost entirely to the sacrificial procedures for the festival, while Deuteronomy’s version refers exclusively to each Israelite’s responsibility to rejoice during the festival at the central sanctuary. Each can stand next to the other without alteration. Even so, this example simply reinforces the observation that there is no evidence in the 4QRP mss for the use of paraphrase to unite parallel pentateuchal laws.

One might tentatively surmise that the editors of the 4QRP mss did not have any interest in reducing the redundancy of pentateuchal law, a cause clearly near and dear to the author of TS.

6.6.3 Rearrangement/Topical Grouping

The passages analyzed above have shown that rearrangement takes on major importance in TS in that it is used to create topical groupings of laws. Col. 52 (Passage 2) collects together a variety of laws pertaining to sacrifice, and indeed TS proceeds
topically, rather than according to the pentateuchal sequence, from this point all the way through 55:13, where it finally arrives back at Deut 17:2 (Deut 17:1 occurs at TS 52:4). We saw further topical arrangement in col. 66, where laws on inappropriate sexual relations from Leviticus 18 and 20 were joined with a similar law in Deut 23:1. The topical ordering apparently continued beyond what is attested in 11QT⁶: in 4Q524, the laws governing sexual relations are followed by the law of levirite marriage (Deut 25:5–10)—the one exception to the general rule that one is not to marry the wife of one’s brother.³⁴⁸

There are hints of similar activity in the 4QRP mss. I mentioned just above that the juxtaposition of the priestly and deuteronomic Sukkot laws (4Q366 frag. 4) may have been intended by the editor responsible as a topical grouping of law, even though the author of TS perceived these laws as parallel and integrated both into a single unit on Sukkot. Unfortunately we have no way of knowing whether the Sukkot laws from Leviticus 23 were originally included in 4Q366’s new arrangement as well. The 4QRP mss also attest several other examples of the rearrangement of law (4Q366 frag. 2; 4Q367 frags 2, 3), but since the juxtaposed laws do not seem particularly related in any of these cases, it is difficult to say that they demonstrate a concern for topical ordering of law. On the other hand, presuming that these juxtapositions were intentional and meaningful, beneath them must lie some kind of concern with the sequence of legal material in the Pentateuch and a willingness to change the received sequence, even if we cannot divine the underlying principle for the new arrangement.

Although our evidence for a concern with the sequence of law in the 4QRP mss is somewhat tenuous, there are clearer indications of concern with sequence as pertains to narrative in 4Q158 and 4Q365. The rearrangement postulated for the second part of the Decalogue in 4Q158 frag. 7, and the juxtaposition of Numbers 4 and 7 and Numbers 27 and 36 in 4Q365 frags 28 and 36, all reflect a concern for the smooth and logical progression of Torah as story: the sequence of events in the revelation of the Decalogue now corresponds to the grammar of the divine speech (first person vs. third); laws that intrude between the narrative elements at the beginning of Numbers are removed; and the two halves of the account of the legal proceedings pertaining to Zelophehad’s daughters are no longer separated by eight chapters of unrelated material but occur one after the other.

TS and some of the 4QRP mss (most clearly, 4Q365 and 4Q366) thus share a concern for the proper sequence of Torah. Beyond this general observation, however, two factors make it difficult to draw more specific conclusions. First, TS is manifestly a legal work; it contains only God’s legislative speech from Sinai, and preserves no narrative material. Since narrative lay outside the author’s purview, it is impossible to know whether his approach would have resembled that of e.g. 4Q365. Second and more significantly, the fragmentary preservation of the 4QRP mss once again rears its ugly head. Rearrangements or new sequences appear once or twice apiece in 4Q158, 4Q365, 4Q366, and 4Q367. It is impossible to guess how frequently they might have occurred in the original, complete version of each manuscript, or whether, in 4Q158 and 4Q365, some might have involved law as well as narrative. For 4Q158 and 4Q365 it might be justified to guess that these sorts of changes were probably not pervasive, since each ms
contains multiple other fragments (in the case of 4Q365, many other fragments) that show no departure from the sequence of the Pentateuch. In 4Q366 and 4Q367, however, new sequences are very frequent in proportion to the total amount of preserved text, occurring in two out of five fragments in 4Q366 and two out of three fragments in 4Q367. Perhaps these manuscripts contained more pervasive changes to the sequence of the Pentateuch as known from elsewhere.

6.6.4 Additions

The amount of additional, nonpentateuchal material in TS is quite large. The analysis above called attention to new laws in several of the passages discussed, e.g. the additional stipulations on the correct time to slaughter the Pesach and on the age limit for mandatory participation (col. 17, Passage 3); the law forbidding the slaughter of a pregnant animal (col. 52, Passage 2); and the prohibition of uncle-niece marriage (col. 66, Passage 4). In addition, I examined one major addition in detail, the laws for the festival of the Firstfruits of Oil (cols 21–22; Passage 5). The analysis revealed that TS, while often adding completely new material; that is, material without any perceivable connection to the pentateuchal text, just as frequently created something new by redeploying pentateuchal material (addition of material from elsewhere). Sometimes this involved extensive verbatim reuse of a particular verse or verses; sometimes the reuse involved substantial reworking. At other times, TS structures new material according to the model of another verse; still elsewhere, it uses idioms and vocabulary characteristic of a section or source in the Pentateuch without drawing on any specific verse. As the
discussion of Passage 5 showed, several of these techniques can occur together in the course of a new section.

The great variety of ways in which TS interacts with Scripture in the course of composing new material allows for a more complete understanding of the shape of additional material in the 4QRP mss. More precisely, it shows how the categories I have defined as “additions of new material” and “additions of material from elsewhere” function as opposite poles on a continuum, with intermediate types of interaction with the Pentateuch falling in between those two poles. While in my study of the 4QRP mss I have classified simply as “addition of new material” any addition that did not reuse a specific verse or part of a verse, I have noted within that category several additions that did show some sort of connection to Scripture, even though it could not be characterized as direct reuse. Furthermore, within the category of “addition of material from elsewhere” were included examples in which the scriptural text is reproduced with varying degrees of exactness. Therefore, additions in the 4QRP mss can be shown to fall at various points on the “continuum” identified on the basis of TS.

Additions of material from elsewhere in the 4QRP mss (or rather, in 4Q158, where the only clear examples of any size occur) are sometimes little more than repetition of the source of the addition, with whatever modifications are necessary to suit the context. This is the case, for example, with the fulfillment notice “so the people returned, each to their tent, and Moses stood before…” (4Q158 7–9 5). In one instance that I have included in this category, however, more extensive modifications were made: I argued that 4Q158 4 6–7 reflects an addition that weaves together elements of Gen 17:7–8 and Exod 6:3–7; thus it is a sort of addition of paraphrased material from elsewhere. In this
way it is analogous to instances where TS incorporates a paraphrased or reworked version of a particular source verse, such as the use of Deut 15:20 (on consumption of firstlings at the Temple) in TS 22:13–14 or the use of Lev 17:3–6 (forbidding slaughter away from the altar) in TS 52:19–21. One might also mention in this context the beginning of the major addition on the Wood Festival in 4Q365 fr. 23, which contains a *Landnahme* formula that reflects Deut 26:1 as well as, most likely, Deut 12:9–11.

Moving further along the continuum, we have seen that TS sometimes creates a new law that employs the grammatical structure of an existing law, such as the prohibition of uncle-niece marriage in TS 66:16–17, which is modeled after the formula of Deut 23:1 (לא יקח איש...). There is only one clear instance of this sort of reuse among the 4QRP mss: in 4Q364 1, the plus אשתו שרה לו ילדה אשר to Gen 25:19 is modeled upon the phrase לאברהם שרה שפחתה ילדה אשר in Gen 25:12.³⁴⁹ Similarly, I find only one possible parallel in the 4QRP mss to the use of language associated with a particular pentateuchal source or genre as opposed to a specific verse. Miriam’s song in 4Q365 6a, c ii uses some of the language of the Song of Moses in Exodus 15, but seems simply to pick up on particular words or phrases, without quoting any specific verse more extensively. The parallel to TS in this case is less than complete, since the language of 4Q365 can be traced to a fairly small unit (Exod 15:1–20), even if not to a more specific verse. When TS uses this technique, it tends to incorporate phrases that recur throughout a book or literary source (like הקהל עלול לזרותכם in Leviticus): the source cannot even be narrowed down as far as a specific chapter.

³⁴⁹ See p. 145 above. There is also an instance of this sort of modeling in SP, in the additions to Genesis 11 that bring it formally into conformity with Genesis 5.
The relative paucity of substantial additions in the 4QRP mss results in few examples to discuss. Even aside from simple matters of preservation, TS sometimes seems to make particularly effective use of some of the above strategies, such as the use of idiomatic phrases like הكثر עולם ודורותיכםחקת. This use of “pentateuchal” style even when no particular verse is in mind may relate to TS’s self-presentation as Sinaitic Torah and the author’s corresponding attempt to make TS sound like the revelation that it claims to be.350 Despite these issues, however, we can on occasion identify similar moves in the 4QRP mss. The fuller preservation of TS and the extensive use it makes of the Pentateuch even in the composition of new laws provides a framework that contextualizes and elucidates some aspects of additions in the 4QRP mss.

6.6.5 Summary

There is no question that TS goes far beyond the reworking of the Pentateuch evident in the 4QRP mss. In the consistency of its concern for topical arrangement of law and for removal of redundancy and parallel laws, in its creative use of existing texts to generate new ones, it exceeds anything we have seen thus far in the course of this study. On the other hand, however, the compositional techniques used to create TS are fundamentally the same as those used in the 4QRP mss, and we have hints in the large-scale modifications in the 4QRP mss of the same concerns as reflected in TS, even if it appears that these techniques are used more frequently and these concerns addressed more consistently in TS. If more were preserved of the 4QRP mss, there would be more

to say about the degree to which the various manuscripts resemble TS—e.g. it is possible, but completely unprovable, that 4Q366 and 4Q367 contained significant resequencing of biblical law. Unfortunately, we can only point to parallels in compositional technique, without being able to undertake a quantitative comparison. Examination of TS has been useful for the understanding of the 4QRP mss because its good preservation allows for a better understanding of how it reuses the pentateuchal text: what is preserved only incompletely and ambiguously in the 4QRP mss is often attested more completely in TS. Moving in the other direction, however, comparison of the two (groups of) texts also elucidates aspects of TS. The 4QRP mss show that the various compositional techniques applied so frequently and thoroughly in TS did not simply originate with the author: others around the same time were also reworking the pentateuchal text with an eye to its underlying structure and coherence, and doing so in ways that are comparable in their specifics to the techniques used in TS. The author of TS adopted these techniques and applied them with perhaps unprecedented consistency to the legal materials of the Torah as a part of his creation of a new divine revelation from Sinai.

This talk of the author’s activity points to one final issue that must be discussed. Previous chapters have concluded with a discussion of how the 4QRP mss and SP might have developed. I have suggested that there is little evidence for a single coherent redaction of any of the 4QRP mss, and that changes may have been made gradually. Most of the major changes in SP reflect such a specific goal that the evidence is much stronger for viewing it as having undergone a single redaction at some point, even though we also have empirical evidence that others of SP’s changes were made at various times, and that the text tradition continued to expand past the point reflected in SP itself. The question of
origins takes on a somewhat different cast with regard to TS, because it indisputably has a structure and organization that separate it from the Pentateuch. Although it does follow the sequence of the Deuteronomic law code for portions of cols 51–66, for the most part it is organized spatially, proceeding outwards from the Temple: First instructions are given for building the Temple itself and the altar. After the construction of the altar comes the list of festivals, which is largely concerned with the sacrifices to be offered upon the altar throughout the year. Thereafter come instructions for the courts of the Temple, followed by rules ensuring the purity of the holy city in which the Temple is located and then governing the purity of the rest of the land of Israel. The deuteronomical section at the end of the Scroll presents laws for the whole land of Israel.351

This structure means that, unlike the 4QRP mss and SP, there is no way that TS could simply have “evolved” from a form of the Pentateuch.352 Someone at some point gave the Scroll its distinct shape. Furthermore, someone decided to cast TS as the direct speech of God. Both the new organizing principle and the change in voicing contribute to the creation in TS of a new literary work out of a combination of pentateuchal and non-pentateuchal materials.353 The new shape definitely distinguishes TS from SP (since we


352 Of course we do not know that this is what happened in the case of the 4QRP mss, but the point is that it could have happened.

353 It may be that complete restructuring of a text in accordance with a new set of organizing principles should be considered another marker of a work intended as a new composition rather than as a new edition of its Vorlage. (See the brief discussion of Michael Segal’s suggested criteria for distinguishing between “Bible” and “Rewritten Bible” in the Introduction, section 1.2.) Such a criterion seems particularly well-suited to law: Josephus, in his *Antiquities*, generally follows the scriptural sequence, but he totally rearranges the pentateuchal laws; see Robert P. Gallant, "Josephus' Expositions of Biblical Law: An Internal Analysis" (Doctoral Dissertation, Yale University, 1988). On the other hand, such a new
know that SP retains the shape and sequence of the Pentateuch), and may distinguish it from the 4QRP mss—unfortunately, we have little evidence as to their original scope and shape. The new divine voicing, however, clearly sets TS apart from both SP and the 4QRP mss. Moreover, the consistency of certain features of TS, like the reordering of law and the conflation of parallel laws, points to a unified redactional/authorial hand.

In making these observations I do not mean that TS was created directly from the Pentateuch alone by a single author. One factor in particular suggests that TS as we have it in 11QTᵃ has a considerable pre-history. This is the extensive overlaps in content (including almost a whole column of virtually identical material) between TS and the material officially labeled 4Q365ᵃ (which I consider a part of 4Q365), pertaining to the courts of the Temple. The parallels are such that there must be a literary relationship between the two texts. This relationship still requires clarification, but given that the 4Q365ᵃ materials are part of a document that appears to be closer in sequence and content to the Pentateuch than is TS, and that the TS version must have been substantially longer, I am inclined to think preliminarily that TS represents the later version and 4Q365ᵃ the earlier.³⁵⁴ If this is correct, then it would appear that whoever is responsible for the basic structure and contents of TS drew upon an existing source for at least some organization is by no means a necessary component of a “rewritten Scripture” composition. This is clear from the book of Jubilees, which generally follows the sequence of Genesis–Exodus.

³⁵⁴ The conclusion that this section must have been considerably longer in TS than in 4Q365ᵃ is based on the fact that 4Q365ᵃ 2 i preserves material parallel to TS col. 38, while col. ii of that same fragment preserves material parallel to TS col. 41. The editor points out that there is no way all the material from TS cols 39–40 could have fit into the available space in 4Q365ᵃ, making clear that TS had a longer text. See White, DJD 13:328–29.
of his instructions for the building of the Temple courts. Yet despite the evidence that the author of TS used earlier sources (besides the Pentateuch), its status as an independent literary work means that its composition was not simply a re-editing of the Pentateuch, and its characteristic features could not simply have come about gradually. The extent to which it differs in this respect from the 4QRP mss, and the possible implications of this difference, will be discussed in the final chapter.

355 An early suggestion that TS is composed of five literary sources—that is, preexisting documents that an editor joined together with minimal redactional activity—still holds sway in TS research. The theory, however, does not address the fact that an author’s compositional technique and use of language might vary based on the subject at hand and the pentateuchal precedent (or lack thereof) for a particular section. For a full critique of the source-critical understanding of TS, see Zahn, "Schneiderei oder Weberei."
CHAPTER 7:
CONCLUSION

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

7.1 A Clearer Understanding of the Texts

The previous chapters have, I hope, demonstrated that great strides can be made in the discussion concerning textual reworking in the late Second Temple period by examining the pertinent texts in detail as opposed to dealing in generalities. This study’s most salient contribution in this regard is a more nuanced picture of how the various texts resemble one another and how they differ. On the one hand, with the exception of the very fragmentary 4Q366 and 4Q367, all of the texts examined here made use of virtually the same compositional techniques. On the other hand, in-depth analysis illustrates the

356 The one compositional technique that did not occur in all the major manuscripts considered here is “replacement with material from elsewhere,” which was restricted to SP except for one very minor case in TS.
extent to which each manuscript possesses a unique “profile”: no two manuscripts were alike in the proportions in which they used various compositional techniques or in the purposes to which they put these techniques.

For the 4QRP mss, instead of a single composition in multiple copies or even a closely affiliated group of texts, the picture emerges of a diverse collection of manuscripts that show some similarities, but also differ in important ways. 4Q366 and 4Q367, despite their extremely poor preservation, show a special predilection towards presenting biblical laws in new sequences. 4Q365 contains proportionately more new material than any of the other texts except TS, with which it is somehow closely affiliated. Its concern with the construction of a Temple complex is, obviously, unique among the 4QRP mss. 4Q365 also shows a concern with sequence, though its two major changes of sequence seem to pertain more to narrative than to legal concerns. 4Q158, on the other hand, seems especially concerned to build textual bridges between related pericopes, and uniquely employs large additions from elsewhere to accomplish this goal. 4Q364 becomes unique in its own way by apparently failing to put particular emphasis on any one compositional technique or compositional goal. Although it contains a variety of additions and other changes, some not precisely identifiable, 4Q364 preserves

357 The case of the juxtaposition of Numbers 27 and 36 is not easily classified as “legal” or “narrative”—the two pericopes deal with the same legal issue and thus their juxtaposition might be seen as reflecting a concern for topical arrangement of law. Yet insofar as the legal issue is framed as a series of appeals to Moses for adjudication, the context is narrative and the juxtaposition could reflect a concern to bring together parts of the storyline that belong together. Perhaps it is best to say simply that, in this case, topical and narrative concerns overlap. Cf. the claim of Moshe Bernstein that here “it is the narrative which appears to govern the sequence and arrangement of the texts”, Bernstein, "What Has Happened to the Laws?,” 36.
proportionately fewer substantial changes than any of the other 4QRP mss, and shows no
sign of any particular editorial concern.

The Samaritan Pentateuch has often been held up as a foil to the 4QRP mss: while
the 4QRP editors felt free to add new materials in the course of their reworking, the
editors responsible for SP were constrained to use only the text of the Pentateuch itself.
As ch. 5 illustrates, an in-depth look at instances of substantial difference between SP and
other versions results in a somewhat more complex picture. It is true that addition of new
material in SP and its forebears rarely exceeds more than few words, and never exceeds
more than a single verse. It is also true that the most prominent changes in SP are
additions from elsewhere, in which large blocks of pentateuchal material are repeated in a
new location. However, my investigation showed that every type of compositional
technique evidenced by the 4QRP mss save one—paraphrase—appeared in SP and its
forebears. These techniques were deployed for a wide variety of purposes, including
improved clarity, lexical harmonization, and to reflect particular exegetical decisions
about the text. Furthermore, the most prominent feature of SP and its forebears, the major
additions of material from elsewhere, was seen to occur in very specific situations
pertaining to very specific types of speech. In other words, instead of taking the major
additions from elsewhere in SP as a sign of the text’s conservatism, we should take them
as indications of a specific exegetical concern on the part of the editors responsible for
the text. Finally, the one compositional technique that occurs in SP but not in the 4QRP
mss, replacement with material from elsewhere, can even be regarded as more radical
than anything found in the 4QRP mss, since it involves omission of pentateuchal material
on a scale not clearly attested in the 4QRP mss. SP and its forebears thus reflect a tradition of pentateuchal revision that should be regarded less as a foil to the 4QRP mss than as another set of witnesses to the same basic process: the revision of the Pentateuch according to a standard set of compositional techniques, but with particular emphases and goals.

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

358 It should be kept in mind, however, that the some of the 4QRP mss may have omitted a great deal more material, depending up how we understand the nature of juxtapositions such as that of Numbers 27 and 36 in 4Q365, mentioned in the previous note. See above, section 4.2.5.

359 See the discussion in section 6.6 above.
4QRP mss. TS thus constitutes yet another distinctive use of a more widespread approach to revision of the pentateuchal text.

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

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

7.2 Implications

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

7.2.1 Compositional Techniques and Interpretive Goals

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

It is perhaps to be expected that some compositional techniques, especially additions of new material, minor alterations, and paraphrase, appear to serve a wide variety of purposes. In contrast to other types of changes that I will discuss below, these compositional techniques are quite “open” in the sense that there is little or no limitation inherent in the technique itself on how it is used. Thus, minor additions and alterations accomplish quite a variety of interpretive goals, including grammatical or lexical clarification, hermeneutical or halakhic updating, and harmonization of one passage to another. Similarly, larger additions sometimes serve to fill perceived gaps (the new blessing in 4Q158 frag. 1–2; the note about the making of the Urim and Thummim in SP Exod 28:30), sometimes introduce new law (TS passim; the wood offering in 4Q365 frag. 23), and sometimes elude us in regard to their precise purpose (e.g. the addition pertaining to Jacob’s flight to Aram in 4Q364 3 ii). Paraphrase is a somewhat poorly-defined category in 4QRP and does not appear at all in SP, but it is still evident that this
technique could serve a variety of purposes. Rewording can unify parallel passages (as in TS’s passover law in col. 17), can make one passage more closely resemble another (as in TS’s incest laws in col. 66 or 4Q158’s rewording of Exodus 6 in light of Exodus 15 in frag. 14), or can simply clarify or update the wording of a passage (as in the paraphrase of Deut 2:34 in 4Q364 frag. 24). These techniques in a way constitute a toolkit or palette of colors which the rewriter can use to create whatever meaning is deemed necessary.

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

Nevertheless, even these inherently “bound” techniques are used for a great variety of purposes in the texts examined here. Addition of material from elsewhere is especially interesting in this regard. We have seen that smaller additions from elsewhere overwhelmingly serve to harmonize two passages at the level of their syntax or, especially, their vocabulary. Larger additions from elsewhere have most often been regarded as the vehicle by which SP and its forebears carry out their paradigmatically “harmonistic” editing of the pentateuchal text. On the one hand, we have seen that these types of changes in SP are not simply harmonistic, but reflect a special concern with the
coordination of speech events and their consequences. On the other hand, 4Q158 and TS demonstrate that this same technique can function in many more ways than it does in SP. 4Q158 sometimes uses additions from elsewhere in contexts very similar to SP—e.g., a command without any notice of its fulfillment—but also uses the same technique less technically, to reinforce (not create) the connections between an event and its recollection or a command or promise and its fulfillment, and even to indicate textually an exegetical association between two disparate events. In TS, addition of material from elsewhere can serve as the basis for the creation of new law, as in the new firstfruits festivals that TS constructs on the basis of the Holiness Code’s instructions for the festival of Weeks. In this legal situation, as opposed to narrative settings, the repetition does not create or reinforce a connection between two events. Instead, the redeployment of pentateuchal language situates the new law among its older predecessors, allowing the new law to partake of the authority of the original law by partaking of its language.  

Similar to addition from elsewhere, rearrangement can also function in a variety of ways, despite the inherent limitations of the technique. In other words, the texts examined here indicate that there are multiple reasons why an editor might wish to change the sequence of the source text. We see a concern to improve the logic of the sequence in 4Q365, 4Q366, and TS. The latter two texts each evidence a concern for the topical grouping of law: laws on similar subjects should not be scattered haphazardly, but occur together. In 4Q365, the concern for sequence applies to narrative: the logical

---

360 The observation that TS reuses scriptural texts, even when composing new law, in order to appear ancient and authoritative was first made by Brin, "המקדש במגילת המקרא." See especially p. 214. For further discussion of the relationship between TS’s claim to authority and its reworking of scriptural texts, see Zahn, "New Voices," 441-42.
progression of the storyline prompts the removal or relocation of irrelevant intervening material. Similarly, SP uses rearrangement to solve the logical difficulty of the Israelites “seeing the thunder” in Exod 20:18. In other instances, though, other criteria seem to cause the change of sequence. The two largest cases of rearrangement in SP are harmonistic in the sense that the new sequence conforms the text more closely to the sequence of a corresponding pericope. In the rearrangement of the Decalogue that seems to have taken place between 4Q158 frags 6 and 7, the editor appears to respond to a wider exegetical issue: the problem of the mediation of the commandments and the shift from first- to third-person reference to God within the Decalogue.

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

Although this result may seem largely negative (i.e., there tends not to be a strong correlation between particular compositional techniques and the uses to which they are put), it clarifies in important ways one “leg” of the triangular system of interrelationships described above. Some compositional techniques allow almost unlimited freedom in terms of how they can be used; others permit a narrower range of options. Considering

---

361 On the difficulty of characterizing precisely the nature of the new sequences created in 4Q365, see section 4.2.5 above.
the range of uses to which a single technique is put in various texts provides a window into the “tool kit” as well as the creativity of Second Temple scribes. This is especially true with the techniques that do contain some inherent limitations, as use of these techniques might otherwise too easily be left undifferentiated.

7.2.2 Compositional Techniques and the Status of a Rewritten Text

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

* A priori, a negative answer lies closest to hand based on the results described in the previous section. The texts considered here include one group readily acknowledged to constitute copies of the Pentateuch (SP and its forebears); one text representing a new composition (TS); and one group (the 4QRP mss) whose status is disputed, though I would incline to regarding them as copies of the Pentateuch. All of these texts share a basic set of compositional techniques, and although different texts use different techniques for different purposes and in differing proportions, there is little clear evidence that would suggest a correlation between textual status and the methods and goals of textual reworking.

It is worth considering, however, whether TS might present some evidence for just such a correlation. That is, insofar as the author of TS rewrites the pentateuchal text
for the purpose of creating a new composition that presents itself as divine revelation from Sinai, might we not regard some of the instances of reworking in TS as specifically contributing to this purpose and thus closely linked to the status of the text? In at least one case this is obviously true: TS contains a large number of minor alterations in which reference to God in the third person is transformed to first-person reference; thus יהוה often becomes אני, and so forth. This series of changes is obviously the means by which the author creates the new divine voice for his work, a voice which helps to make clear that TS is not simply a copy of the legal sections of the Pentateuch, but a new composition. Yet this type of change is most profitably considered under the rubric of the theory that literary features like voice and setting are the primary ways by which authors signal that a text should be read as a new composition.\(^{362}\) It is approaching tautology to say that the author of a rewritten text constituting a new composition will use rewriting to change the literary features of the text to indicate that it is a new composition! To put it another way, since changes in voice and setting already indicate to us the possible status of a rewritten composition, we do not gain very much by saying that the use of particular compositional techniques for the purpose of changing voice or setting suggests that the work that does this sort of thing is likely a new composition.

Beyond these obvious changes in TS, however, there may be other distinctive features of its rewriting that owe their presence to TS’s particular character. For example, alone of the texts considered here, TS shows concern to reduce the redundancy of law, often using paraphrase to combine parallel laws into a single piece of legislation (as we

\(^{362}\) See above, section 1.2.
saw with the Passover and Mazzot laws). Might this use of paraphrase be motivated by TS’s self-presentation as divine revelation, a context in which presumably redundancy would not be expected? I have suggested in an earlier article that some changes made by TS are made specifically with the purpose of supporting the text’s Sinaitic claims, the logic being that, since the text purports to constitute God’s direct speech from Mt. Sinai, the author’s attempts to smooth out inconsistencies and redundancies in the pentateuchal text amount to an attempt to make TS’s legal revelation fitting for the divinity through whom it is revealed.363 Thus parts of TS’s rewriting, such as reducing legal redundancy, may in fact be specifically connected to its new voice and setting, and thus to its status as a new composition.

Even if this is true, however (and I believe it is), several factors should caution against trying to use the evidence of TS to formulate any sort of general principle regarding the relationship between compositional techniques or the purposes to which they are put and the status of the composition in which they occur. To begin with, the problems inherent in the pentateuchal text vis-à-vis the claim to direct divine revelation made by TS—namely, that the Pentateuch is contradictory and redundant—are equally relevant in the context of transmission and revision of the pentateuchal text itself. We have seen many examples of attempts to smooth out the text in SP and in the 4QRP mss. TS presents itself as direct divine revelation, but the Pentateuch, at the time of the rewritings we are considering, was already starting to be read as divine revelation, with all the expectations of consistency that that perception entailed. If the author of TS

363 Zahn, "New Voices."
“improves” the text in order to make it better fit the claim that this new text is divinely revealed, other scribes, working on the text of the Pentateuch itself, made the same types of moves in order that the pentateuchal text itself might better reflect the claims of divinity and completeness being made of it.

The fact that TS is specifically concerned with legal redundancy, an issue not addressed in the other texts examined here, does not fundamentally change this picture. In fact, almost all of the texts included in this study appeared to have specific concerns—manifested in the use of specific compositional techniques for specific purposes—that were less prominent or absent in all the others. For example, 4Q158 alone used large additions from elsewhere to create topical links between independent passages, while SP used the same technique to address the precedents or consequences of speech events in very specific situations. Thus, the absence of similar concern for legal redundancy in the other texts included here does not necessarily have any connection to issues of textual status (pentateuchal vs. new composition). Furthermore, although constant recourse to the fact that the 4QRP mss are highly fragmentary should be avoided—we should work with the evidence we have—we can keep in mind that we may not have the whole picture.

This conclusion about redundancy might be challenged on the grounds that, as part of their broader conception of the text of Torah as perfect and all-encompassing, the rabbis essentially refused to regard redundancies as such. Redundancy, in other words, was only apparent, and every part of the Torah had something to teach. Since I have

been suggesting that conceptions of the text similar to that of the rabbis influenced much of the rewriting witnessed in my texts, perhaps it would be better to assume that such an attitude towards redundancy was similarly already operative in the late Second Temple period. In that case, one might conclude that there would have been a concern to preserve redundancy in copies of the Pentateuch, since that redundancy may already have been regarded as hermeneutically generative. This in turn might constitute evidence that a text like TS, which radically reduces the Pentateuch’s legal redundancy, could not in fact have constituted a copy of the Pentateuch.

The problem with this challenge is that I see no good reason to assume that the rabbinic attitude towards redundancy was widespread in the period in which the texts examined here were produced. Indeed, there is some evidence that such an attitude had not yet developed. First, it seems inherently reasonable that, just as issues of sequence, style, theology, and halakhah could be addressed in our period through direct intervention into the pentateuchal text, issues of redundancy could, too. Second, evidence that this could happen is found in SP, albeit in a narrative as opposed to a legal context. In some of the cases of change that I have labeled “replacement with material from elsewhere,” a part of the pentateuchal text is deleted—replaced—because it is redundant; because it says the same thing said by another passage. For instance, when an editor inserts the account of Moses’ appointment of judges from Deuteronomy 1 into the parallel account in Exodus 18, he eliminates the one verse of the Exodus account that created obvious and

365 Kugel, for instance, notes that the principle he terms “omnisignificance”—the conviction that every detail of Scripture is meaningful—“finds its fullest expression in rabbinic writings, [but] its traces can be found far earlier”; Kugel, Traditions of the Bible, 17.
insoluble narrative redundancy: the part that simply could not be told twice.\textsuperscript{366} SP here shows both that editors were sensitive to the issue of redundancy and that they—at least some of them—were willing to delete pentateuchal material in order to remove redundancy. Although we have no extant examples in SP or the 4QRP mss of omission of an entire law for reasons of redundancy, it seems unwarranted to assume that such an action was impossible in a pentateuchal text.

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

\textsuperscript{366} See section 5.5 above.
been possible here will provide new perspectives on the relationship between rewriting and textual status.

7.2.3 A Continuum of Scriptural Reworking?

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

Before reflecting on the latter question, it is important to consider the degree to which the results of my study problematize the concept of a continuum in the first place. We have seen that reworking is not like filling a glass or painting a room, such that the amount of “reworked” as opposed to “non-reworked” text could easily be quantified. Instead, rewriting is a process that manifests itself in a variety of compositional techniques and that deposits in writing an even wider variety of exegetical concerns. While most people might agree intuitively that, for example, the Pentateuch is more heavily reworked in TS than in SP, in order for the idea of a continuum to have more than intuitive value it must be possible to quantify accurately the amount of reworking in various texts. Several factors militate against the practicality, if not the possibility, of such quantification. First, given that the text to which changes were being made was constantly in flux in this period, how could we ever determine with the necessary precision what constitutes a change? Although in many cases the status of a variant as a deliberate change is clear, in many minor cases the more original reading cannot be
determined. Second, even if it were possible to quantify precisely the number of words retained vs. words changed or added in a given rewritten text, how are changes like rearrangements counted? No words are necessarily removed or added, but certainly change has taken place. The problems only multiply: should additions from elsewhere be regarded as less significant than addition of brand-new material? What of changes that, though small in size, have major exegetical import? It seems wrong that the addition of the word מלאך in SP Num 23:4–5, which reflects a substantive theological issue, should be given the same quantitative weight as the addition of a word, like שמה in 4Q158 1–2 3, that does not actually impact the meaning of the text—yet how would the difference between these two examples be reflected quantitatively? My point is that the idea of a quantitative continuum breaks down in the face of the qualitative differences between various compositional techniques and between the various purposes to which they were put, as exemplified in this study. Careful study of individual rewritten texts indicates that the key features of each are the range of techniques they employ and the specific purposes for which they employ those techniques. A text’s character is not captured simply by trying to determine “how different” it is from its Vorlage—and indeed, such an attempt would likely be quick to founder.

If quantification is, on the one hand, inevitably inaccurate and, on the other hand, less than satisfactory in terms of what it tells us about each individual text, its potential to help us distinguish new rewritten compositions from copies of biblical texts seems all the more in jeopardy. If we cannot accurately plot where each text lies along a continuum, there is no way to draw a line at a given point on the continuum separating “Bible” from “not-Bible.” This is not to say that quantity plays no role: if, for example, the book of
Genesis started with the creation of the world and the Garden of Eden but then followed the history of the snake as it crawled on its belly and begot its offspring in numerous generations, it would no longer be Genesis. (On the other hand, this would no longer be rewriting in any sustained sense, either.) It seems foolish to deny that texts can base themselves on an earlier text, yet depart so drastically from it that they can no longer be considered the “same text.” Yet in order to advance the discussion, it seems most profitable to abandon the notion of a continuum of reworking and think instead about how exactly readers or hearers construe texts. How are differences between two texts perceived and evaluated? Faced with two texts that have many similarities but perhaps many differences, what are the conditions under which a reader will regard the two as versions of the same text as opposed to two different texts? Obviously I cannot answer these questions here, but the more nuanced picture of reworking that has resulted from this study suggests that it is time for us to stop thinking in terms of “amount of reworking” and start looking for new conceptual tools that will provide new frameworks and vocabulary for discussing the various forms early Jewish scriptural rewriting could take.

7.2.4 Looking Ahead

The previous paragraph indicates that this study constitutes only one step in what must be a longer process of analysis of rewritten texts and reassessment of the terminology and categories we use to describe them. It is my hope that this study of the

367 This is patently the case with, e.g., 1 Enoch, which is at least partially inspired by aspects of the Primeval History in Genesis, but does not interact in any sustained way with the pentateuchal text.
4QRP mss will provide the impetus for similar work on other texts and a better understanding of the similarities and differences between the wide variety of rewritten texts known from Qumran and elsewhere. In closing, I will simply indicate two primary directions that I would like to see this work take.

First, many rewritten texts remain in need of the type of detailed analysis used here, particularly from the perspective of compositional technique and exegetical goals. These texts include the Genesis Apocryphon, Jubilees, Josephus’s *Antiquities*, and others. The pentateuchal Targumim constitute a rich trove of rewriting that should also be brought into the discussion.368 Furthermore, a fuller analysis of exegetical variants identifiable in the biblical versions, such as that programmatically begun by Andrew Teeter in his recent dissertation, is also necessary.369

Second, an important object of future study will be clarification of the place of rewritten texts from the Second Temple period in the history of Jewish thought. On the one hand, it should be determined if and exactly how rewriting from this period continues processes operative in earlier stages of the formation of the Pentateuch (e.g. Deuteronomy’s reuse of the Covenant Code), which in turn can be traced back to scribal practices current in the Ancient Near East at least as far back as the second millennium BCE.370 On the other hand, there should be continued study of the ways in which

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

369 Teeter, "Exegesis".

pentateuchal reworking anticipates the work of the rabbis, especially as regards attitudes towards the scriptural text and exegetical method.  

Ultimately, the importance of understanding rewritten texts lies in their prevalence as a mode of interpretation in the late Second Temple period. Both revised versions of biblical books and new compositions of the sort we have labeled “rewritten Scripture” attest to a remarkable period in the history of exegesis. At this time, notions of the sanctity, antiquity, and divine origins of the text were well-developed. Yet this did not translate into the inviolability of the text or the cessation of access to traditional loci of revelation like Mount Sinai. The relationship between sacred text and faithful reader was different from what it would become in later Judaism and Christianity. In this setting, the faithful transmitter of ancient and sacred tradition could, at the same time, be an innovator, whose own faithfulness to the tradition demanded reshaping of it.

APPENDIX A: UNIQUE READINGS IN THE 4QREWORKED PENTATEUCH MANUSCRIPTS

The following table lists all the instances in the 4QRP mss where the text departs from known versions of the Pentateuch, grouped by compositional technique and by size. Only unique readings and only readings that are at least partially extant are included. Purely and obviously orthographic variants are excluded. It should be kept in mind that, especially in the case of minor variations, the 4QRP mss may represent a more original reading than that of other versions.
## TABLE A.1

**UNIQUE READINGS IN THE 4QRP MANUSCRIPTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compositional Technique</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Addition of New Material</strong></td>
<td>Large (one line or more)</td>
<td>4Q158 1–2 7–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q158 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q364 3 1–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q364 10 7–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q364 15 3–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 6a ii 1–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 23 4–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate (up to one line)</td>
<td>4Q158 6 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q158 7 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q364 1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q364 4b–e i 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q364 24 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q364 28 2–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q364 30 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q364 30 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 5 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 6a i 9–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 12 iii 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 26 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE A.1 (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Small** (generally a single word) | 4Q158 1–2 3 (שם) 372
| | 4Q158 1–2 4 (_ANDROID)
| | 4Q158 1–2 5 (ל)
| | 4Q158 1–2 13 (שנית)
| | 4Q158 1–2 14 (לאומד)
| | 4Q158 4 3 (למעסף)
| | 4Q158 7 4 (את)
| | 4Q158 13 2 (קדיש)
| | 4Q364 1 5 (תורה)
| | 4Q364 4b–e ii 10 (את)
| | 4Q364 24 12 (בותך)
| | 4Q364 24 15 (למלתמה)
| | 4Q364 30 4 (לעלץ)
| | 4Q365 9 ii 4 (את בול)
| | 4Q365 10 1 (היא)
| | 4Q365 10 3 (הנה)
| | 4Q365 26 1 (בול)
| | 4Q365 26 6 (כמה)
| | 4Q365 27 4 (שמח)
| | 4Q365 32 6 (יוד)
| | 4Q365 32 8 (ב)
| | 4Q365 32 9 (בדיכסה)
| | 4Q366 2 6 (לא אבותה -)

| **Addition of Material from Elsewhere** | Large | 4Q158 1–2 1–13
| | 4Q158 4 6–8 (+ paraphrase)
| **Moderate** | 4Q158 1–2 12
| | 4Q158 1–2 16
| | 4Q158 4 2
| | 4Q158 7 5
| | 4Q364 4b–e ii 3
| | 4Q364 21 2
| | 4Q365 6b 5
| **Small** | 4Q364 4b–e ii 14 (שה)
| | 4Q365 24 4 (חרות)

---

372 Words in parentheses are meant as a guide for easy identification of the variation in question. For this reason I do not indicate reconstructed or probable letters. All readings for 4Q364–367 follow Tov and Crawford’s edition in DJD 13.
TABLE A.1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Omission</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 12 iiii 7 (eyeskip)</td>
<td>4Q364 19 7</td>
<td>4Q364 24 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 6a ii 8</td>
<td>4Q364 24 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q364 26b, e, ii 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q364 36b, e, ii 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 12 i 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 12 iii 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 12 iii 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 16 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 25 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 26 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 27 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 31 6 (interlinear)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 36 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrase</td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q158 3 (+ additions)</td>
<td>4Q158 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q158 4 4</td>
<td>4Q364 24 9–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 37 2–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rearrangement</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>4Q158 7–9 1–2 (Decalogue)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>4Q365 32 1–2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>4Q365 6a ii 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Alterations</td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q158 6 8 (אשר)</td>
<td>4Q158 10–12 4 (אש)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q158 10–12 6 (יבעה)</td>
<td>4Q364 3 8 (מדע)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q364 5b ii 13</td>
<td>4Q364 4b–e i 6 (אשרנים)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q364 11 5 (משעה)</td>
<td>4Q364 13 8 (יקוט)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q364 14 3 (זכרון)</td>
<td>4Q364 14 5 (לעל全て)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4Q364 17 1 (שם)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

373 Note that most of these cases may well represent more original shorter readings as opposed to true omissions; see sections 4.1.3 and 4.2.3 above.

374 Probably an error or an orthographic variant.
| Minor Alterations (continued) | 4Q364 17 3 (הארון)
4Q364 17 5 (עצה)
4Q364 20 7 (ארדרה)
4Q364 25 9 (הרואת אמתה)
4Q364 26b, e ii 4 (הר
4Q364 28 3 (🐰)
4Q364 30 4 (מעז)
4Q364 32 2 (נתון)
4Q364 26 2 (הודית)
4Q365 6a i 3 (לארון)
4Q365 6a i 11 (תורן)
4Q365 6b 4 (סמח)
4Q365 6a ii 13 (תוקית)
4Q365 7 i 3 (伊斯קלון)
4Q365 7 i 4 (סוע)
4Q365 7 ii 2 (יתר חותם מושה)
4Q365 7 ii 3 (נסבך)
4Q365 8 1 (הארה)
4Q365 8 3 (מסבך)
4Q365 9 ii 2 (省公安)
4Q365 9 ii 3 (בגדים)
4Q365 9 ii 3 (אהרון)
4Q365 10 i 3 (לבצלמו)
4Q365 12 i 6 (לאוהל מועד)
4Q365 12 ii 6–14 (ועש, 8x)
4Q365 12 iii 2 (וшу)
4Q365 12 iii 3 (לוא)
4Q365 12 iii 5 (לא)
4Q365 12 iii 5 (ויהב)
4Q365 12 iii 8 (אגרים)
4Q365 12 iii 13 (ועשה)
4Q365 12 iii 13 (בנ ירואל) |

375 Note this reading also occurs in 4Q365 8 1.

376 This reading is either an error or, if the yod is read as a waw, reflects the reading of G.

377 Note this reading also occurs in 4Q364 17 3.

378 Unless this is simply an orthographic variant, לוא is an error for ל.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Alterations (continued)</th>
<th>4Q365 13 1 (טבשית)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 15 5 (למרות, 2x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 17 2 (ואל)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 23 2 (ה תודה)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 25 14 (והמעון)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 27 2 (לקלות)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 27 2 (ממשחילו)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 27 3 (ממשיחו, 2x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 27 4 (ולמעילה)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 27 5 (קדוש)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 28 2 (вшיב)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 29 2 (כסף אחד)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 31 6 (=in, interlinear)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q366 32 6 (את הרת)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 32 6 (אות)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 32 7 (אות)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 32 7 (הנתון)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 32 10 (ויעל)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 38 1 (כבדו)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q366 3 5 (מנזדה)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q366 5 3 (לمؤנה)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q367 1 4 (אם)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q367 1 8 (דם)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Change Unclear</td>
<td>4Q158 1–2 1–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q158 1–2 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q158 1–2 17–19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q158 4 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q158 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q364 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q364 5 ii 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q364 7 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q364 14 1–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q364 18 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q364 22 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q364 24 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q364 26a ii 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q364 26b, e ii 1–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q364 27 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 10 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 12 iii 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 26 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 28 (juxtaposition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q365 36 (juxtaposition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q366 2 (juxtaposition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q366 4 (juxtaposition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q367 2 (juxtaposition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q367 3 (juxtaposition)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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