

2007

# How to Rewrite Torah: The Case for Proto-Sectarian Ideology in the Reworked Pentateuch (4QRP)

Roger S. Nam

*George Fox University*, rnam@georgefox.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/gfes>

 Part of the [Religion Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Nam, Roger S., "How to Rewrite Torah: The Case for Proto-Sectarian Ideology in the Reworked Pentateuch (4QRP)" (2007). *Faculty Publications - Portland Seminary*. 87.

<https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/gfes/87>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Portland Seminary at Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications - Portland Seminary by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact [arolf@georgefox.edu](mailto:arolf@georgefox.edu).

# HOW TO REWRITE TORAH:

## The Case for Proto-Sectarian Ideology in the *Reworked Pentateuch (4QRP)\**

### Summary

This study challenges the initial categorization of the *Reworked Pentateuch* (4Q364-4Q367) as another non-sectarian textual witness to the Torah. A close analysis of the manuscripts suggests that certain unaligned readings likely reflect some of the sectarian ideas of the community. Other variants evoke both content and ideology of the authoritative “Rewritten Bible” documents, the *Temple Scroll* and *Jubilees*. These characteristics imply that 4QRP contains deliberate reworking of biblical material that is in line with sectarian ideology, in contrast to a mere mechanical copying of the text. Though the scroll may not be strictly sectarian, at the very least, it is proto-sectarian in that 4QRP served as source material for the community’s ideology.

### 1. Introduction

THE *Reworked Pentateuch* (hereafter, 4QRP) is one of the more intriguing texts from Qumran published in the last decade. Emanuel Tov and Sidnie White (Crawford), the editors of the *editio princeps*, assert that the manuscripts of 4Q364-4Q367 and 4Q158 represent copies of the same text. (1) All five scrolls include

(\*) This article is an expanded version of a paper delivered on February 18, 2006 to the Biblical Colloquium West. I wish to thank Professor David Noel Freedman and the members of the Colloquium for the invitation as well as their helpful comments. In addition, I wish to thank Professor William M. Schniedewind for his careful reading and improvements of several drafts of this article.

(1) For a review of the textual relationship between these manuscripts, see Emanuel Tov and Sidnie White (Crawford), “4Q364-4Q367. 4QReworked Pentateuch<sup>b-c</sup> and 365a 4QTemple?” In *Qumran Cave 4 VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (ed. Harold Attridge et al.; DJD 13; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 188-91; Sidnie White Crawford, “Three Fragments from Qumran Cave 4 and Their Relationship to the

Pentateuchal material along with brief exegetical comments of varying length from just a few words to as many as eight lines. The manuscripts pay limited attention to order, and they freely add and delete sections of the Hebrew Bible. Such fluidity on the Pentateuch makes it apparent that the text is not merely another biblical manuscript. Rather, White (Crawford) classifies *4QRP* in the category of "Rewritten Torah." (2) In the preliminary report of *4QRP*, White (Crawford) makes the following observation: "In content, there is nothing strictly sectarian...this scroll with its eclectic text of the Pentateuch, may not be a Qumran composition, but rather may have been brought into the sect from the outside." (3) Rather than being a sectarian work, White (Crawford) and Tov suggest that this is just another textual witness to the Torah, related to the proto-Samaritan Pentateuch based on the number of affinities that the text has with the Samaritan Pentateuch in disagreement with the MT. (4) The text also has some exclusive agreement with the LXX and a few non-aligned readings as well.

This paper challenges the initial categorization of this text as merely a non-sectarian biblical tradition from the proto-Samaritan Pentateuch. A close analysis of the manuscripts, particularly the larger scrolls of *4Q364* and *4Q365*, reveals several interesting attributes. First, *4QRP* makes subtle changes to the text that likely reflect some of the sectarian ideas of the community. Second, the content of *4QRP* has close affinities to the *Temple Scroll* and *Jubilees*, both of which have a degree of authoritative status within the Qumran community. Third, the orthography, morphology and scribal notations of *4QRP* point towards Qumran copying of the text, and more likely, Qumran sectarian usage. These attributes suggest that *4QRP* contains deliberate reworking of biblical material that is in line with sectarian ideology, in contrast to a mere mechanical copying of the existing texts. Though the scroll may not be strictly sectarian, at the very least, it is proto-sectarian, in that *4QRP* served as source material for sectarian ideology. More broadly, the implications of this brief study force us to dispose of any strict polarity between sectarian

Temple Scroll," *JQR* 85 (1994): 259-73; for an alternative interpretation of one of the scrolls, see George J. Brooke, "4Q158: Reworked Pentateuch<sup>a</sup> or Reworked Pentateuch A?" *DSD* 8 (2001): 219-41.

(2) Sidnie Ann White (Crawford), "4Q364 & 365: A Preliminary Report," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18-21 March, 1991* (2 vols.; ed. Julio Trebelle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11; Madrid: Editorial Complutense; Leiden: Brill, 1992) 1. 228.

(3) White (Crawford), "4Q364 & 365: A Preliminary Report," 220.

(4) Tov and White (Crawford) cautiously state, "This relation (of *4QRP*) tilts the evidence towards the Samaritan Pentateuch," Tov and White (Crawford), *Qumran Cave 4.VIII*, 195.

versus non-sectarian in favor of a broader continuum when classifying the scrolls. (5)

## 2. Proto-Sectarian Textual Variants

Overall, the text of *4QRP* adheres quite closely to the MT, making variants and additions much more salient. Tov and White (Crawford) typically interpret such changes as either exegetical additions, or alternate textual traditions. (6) Admittedly, these explanations can sufficiently account for most of the variant readings of *4QRP*. However, some of the changes are better explained as arising from ideological forces.

One such change occurs in *Exod* 17:5, found in *4Q365* 7 i.4. For the crucial phrase זקני ישראל (“elders of Israel”), the scribe of the Qumran manuscript replaces the word ישראל (“Israel”) with העדה (“assembly”). The Samaritan Pentateuch, Peshitta and various Targumim all agree with the MT against *4QRP*, suggesting a deliberate re-working of the biblical text by the Qumran community. (7) A closer examination of this variant supports such an interpretation. The phrase זקני ישראל occurs thirty-two times in the MT, yet appears only once in all non-biblical Qumran literature. In contrast, the phrase זקני העדה occurs merely two times in the Hebrew Bible, and appears in one other instance in the Qumran non-biblical corpus, the *Temple Scroll*. (8) Throughout several highly sectarian scrolls, such as the *Rule of the Congregation* (*IQSa*), the *Damascus Document* (*CD*) and the *War Scroll* (*IQM*), the term עדה specifically refers to the commu-

(5) This paper assumes McGuire’s dimensional sociological typology of a sect, meaning that the group has a strong claim for the possession of sole truth, and a relatively high tension between the group and society. As a starting point, Jutta Jokiranta’s methodology is used for determining the sectarian nature of a Qumran text: “The tension with socio-cultural environment, given that one can specify the scope of analysis, and the tendency to view oneself as uniquely legitimate, or the tendency to set up boundaries against others.” Jutta Jokiranta, “‘Sectarianism’ of the Qumran ‘Sect’: Sociological Notes,” *RdQ* 20 (2001): 229, 238. For other definitions of sect during the Second Temple period, see Albert I. Baumgarten, *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation* (JSJSup 55; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 5-15; also Shayne J.D. Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah* (LEC; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1988), 125-27.

(6) Tov and White (Crawford), *Qumran Cave 4.VIII*, 192-96.

(7) Parenthetically, the LXX uses the term λαός (“people”) in *Exod* 17:5, following neither the MT (one would expect Ἰσραήλ for ישראל) nor *4Q365* (συναγωγὴ for עדה), but rather a Greek term that is used almost exclusively for ἔθνος (“people”). Both the LXX and *4QRP* reflect different social settings for translating the concept of Jewish people. For the LXX, the compilers did not care to distinguish the Jewish peoples, thus they chose a general term. For Qumran, this social group refers to a restricted group, specifically, their own elite leaders, and accordingly, *4Q365* uses a precise term in lieu of the Jerusalem group זקני ישראל.

(8) *Lev* 4:16; *Judg* 21:16; *11QT<sup>a</sup>* 42.13-14.

nity at Qumran. In *4QRP*, the insertion of the phrase זקני העדה suggests a deliberate manipulation of the text in order to subvert the authority of the Jerusalem group זקני ישראל. By changing this specific term, the Qumran scribes erase part of the textual evidence that attacks their own legitimacy, while maintaining their allegiance to sacredness of the Torah. The importance of the text of *Exodus* 17 as the last stop of the Israelites before the revelation at Sinai solidifies this interpretation for a sectarian driven edit.

As one of the largest, most important biblical scrolls at Qumran, *4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup>* (*4Q22*) serves as a control to this example of a proto-sectarian edit. This scroll is the only other biblical manuscript at Qumran that deals with the phrase זקני ישראל, which it leaves unchanged. (9) Significantly, this scroll (in contrast to *4QRP*) does not reflect Qumran scribal practice, and therefore, the absence of such ideological changes is expected. (10) With its adherence to a known textual tradition and non-Qumran scribal practice, *4Q22* falls under the rubric of non-sectarian biblical manuscript, whereas *4QRP* appears to be a proto-sectarian rewritten biblical manuscript. (11)

An additional sectarian variant appears in *4Q364* 19a-19b.7, which omits the biblical reference to the first day of the fifth month, the day of Aaron's death. (12) None of the major textual witnesses leave out this pivotal date. Tov and White (Crawford) suggest that the omission may reflect an earlier text, since the Hebrew Bible never mentions the exact dates of Moses' and Miriam's death. (13) A more likely explanation for this omission may lie within the problem of calendrical references. Because of the contention between solar and lunar calendars and the different dates for certain festivals within various strands of Judaism, the Qumran community may have intentionally made this omission. Other biblical passages highlight the importance of this particular date. According to *Zech* 7:3 and 8:9, the fifth month was a time of abstinence and fasting. *Ezra* 7:6-9 states that Ezra arrived to Jerusalem on the first day of the fifth month, an obvious reference to his priestly function. Considering the Qumran community's celebration of the new wine festival, which fell on the third day of the same month according to the *Temple Scroll*, the mention of Aaron's death may have been unnecessary.

(9) *4Q22* xxvi.32, drawing on *Exod* 24:9.

(10) Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 279.

(11) In the DJD publication, the editors suggests that *4Q22* aligns itself most closely to the textual tradition known by the Samaritan Pentateuch, yet without the sectarian addition of a command to build an altar on Mount Gerizim; see Judith E. Sanderson, "4QpaleoExodus<sup>m</sup>," in *Qumran Cave 4 IV: Paleo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (ed. Eugene Ulrich et al.; DJD 9; Oxford: Clarendon, 1992), 65-70.

(12) *Num* 33:38.

(13) Tov and White (Crawford), *Qumran Cave 4.VIII*, 226.

(14) All of these circumstances compel one to question whether this omission was deliberate to further legitimize the Qumran calendar and festival dates.

Individually, the preceding examples of divergent readings in *4QRP* do not unambiguously represent sectarian variants. But in light of the understanding of the Qumran community, its penchant for isolation and the struggles with multiple groups of Judaism for legitimacy, one cannot merely dismiss such variants as disinterested scribal edits nor textual traditions. In contrast, investigating the potential sectarian motivations for such changes can enhance our complete understanding of the scrolls and their place in textual transmission. The proto-sectarian ideology within these minor changes becomes increasingly evident when comparing the content of *4QRP* to two other important Qumran documents.

### 3. Affinities to the *Temple Scroll*

Though scholarship has corrected Yigael Yadin's initial assumption of a Qumran provenance for the *Temple Scroll*, most scholars still argue that it serves as an important and authoritative work for the people of the Qumran sect, possibly as an earlier source for some of their sectarian doctrine. (15) Accordingly, just as proto-sectarian ideology runs in the *Temple Scroll*, so does such influence find itself in *4QRP*. As mentioned earlier, *4QRP* and the *Temple Scroll* are the only two scrolls that contain the phrase זקני העדה. *4QRP*'s omission of the date of Aaron's death eliminates any conflict for the celebration of the *Temple Scroll*'s festival of first wine. As examples of the genre of rewritten scripture, both documents add exegetical commentaries and re-arrange the text of the Torah freely.

Most significantly, *4Q365* 23 shares several non-biblical materials with the *Temple Scroll* regarding festivals. Tov and White (Crawford) note that both *11QT<sup>a</sup>* 11.12 and *4Q365* 23.9 contain an extra-biblical reference to a [מ]ועד היצהר ("festival of fresh oil"), inserted seamlessly as "There is no scribal separation between the biblical and the nonbiblical material." (16) Juxtaposed to this festival, *4QRP* adds the phrase יקריבו את העצים ("they will bring the wood"), referring to the "festival of fresh wood," which also plays a significant role in the

(14) James C. VanderKam, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Routledge, 1998), 68.

(15) George J. Brooke, "Introduction," in *Temple Scroll Studies* (ed. George J. Brooke; JSPSup 7; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 18; Dwight D. Swanson, *The Temple Scroll and the Bible* (STDJ 14; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 239-43; Lawrence H. Schiffman, "Temple Scroll," *ABD* 6. 348-50.

(16) The scroll *4QCalendrical Doc. E<sup>b</sup> v* (*4Q327*) also contains a reference to the "festival of fresh oil;" Tov and White (Crawford), *Qumran Cave 4.VIII*, 293.

*Temple Scroll*. (17) The Hebrew Bible never explicitly mentions either festival, though it hints at them in *Num* 18:12 and *Neh* 10:35. But both Qumran documents emphasize the magnitude of these festivals as God himself commands observance during the Sinaitic revelation to Moses. (18) They are inserted in *Leviticus* 24, after instructions for Sukkot with the authoritative formula, **וידבר יהוה אל משה לאמור** (“The Lord spoke to Moses, saying”), giving a voice of authority to this text of legal tradition. (19) Moshe J. Bernstein argues that by choosing such phrasing within a legal passage, the authors deliberately attempt to legitimize these festivals: “This passage must be considered pseudepigraphic in the strongest authoritative sense.” (20) He describes this as “authoritative pseudepigrapha” as opposed to “convenient pseudepigrapha,” which refers to supplementary interpolations without any intention to convey authority. (21)

In addition to naming these festivals, both texts appear to give identical order on the days of tribal offerings for the festivals:

|                     |                    |                       |
|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
|                     | 4Q365 23.10-11     | 11QT <sup>a</sup> XIV |
| 1 <sup>st</sup> day | Levi...            | Levi and Judah        |
| 2 <sup>nd</sup> day | ...                | Benjamin and Joseph   |
| 3 <sup>rd</sup> day | [Reu]ben and Simon | Reuben and Simon      |
| 4 <sup>th</sup> day | ...                | Issachar and Zebulon  |
| 5 <sup>th</sup> day | ...                | Gad and Asher         |
| 6 <sup>th</sup> day | ...                | Dan and Naphtali (22) |

This tribal order does not appear elsewhere in ancient Jewish literature. This list of offerings to the temple originally restricted itself to Levites and the tribes of the Judean exile, Judah and Benjamin. Jacob Milgrom states that the new complete list fits well with the communal nature of the Qumran sect. For this group, the privilege of donating temple wood is no longer restricted, but available to all tribes. (23) Because of this shared text between the two scrolls, White Crawford suggests that the *Temple Scroll* used 4Q365 as source ma-

(17) 4Q365 23.9.

(18) Jacob Milgrom, “Qumran’s Biblical Hermeneutics: The Case of the Wood Offering,” *RdQ* 16 (1994): 449-56.

(19) 4Q365 23.4.

(20) Moshe J. Bernstein, “Pseudepigraphy in the Qumran Scrolls: Categories and Functions,” in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigraphia in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12-14 January 1997* (ed. Esther Chazon and Michael E. Stone; STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 12.

(21) An example of convenient pseudepigraphy in 4QRP is the Song of Miriam in 4Q365, 6a-6c ii.1-15; Bernstein, “Pseudepigraphy,” 11-12.

(22) White (Crawford), “Preliminary Report,” 225-27.

(23) Milgrom, “Biblical Hermeneutics,” 453-54.

terial on the evidence that the former is a more complex, openly ideological reworking of the Torah. (24) Such a declaration certainly implies authoritative status of 4QRP.

All of these correlations signal the close affinities between 4QRP and the *Temple Scroll* in their content of biblical text plus additions. (25) Such a connection reinforces the concept of 4QRP as a proto-sectarian work with muted ideological influence.

#### 4. Affinities to *Jubilees*

4QRP also has connections with *Jubilees*, which though not a text written at Qumran, the presence of at least fifteen copies and the *Damascus Document's* reference to *Jubilees* substantiates its authoritative status within the community. (26) These connections go be-

(24) Sidnie White Crawford, "The Rewritten Bible at Qumran," in *The Hebrew Bible and Qumran* (ed. James Charlesworth; N. Richland Hills: Bibal Press, 2000), 188-89.

(25) These exclusive connections between the two scrolls concerning festivals compel some scholars to place 4Q365 23 with the *Temple Scroll*. Yigael Yadin (*The Temple Scroll, Three Volumes and Supplement* [rev. Eng. ed; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983]) published this fragment along as a part of the original *Temple Scroll* publication, a connection that Ben Zion Wacholder ("The Fragmentary Remains of 11QTorah (Temple Scroll)," *HUCA* 62 [1991]: 1-116) later confirmed. Contrary to Yadin's assessment, John Strugnell identified the content and paleography of the fragment to the rest of 4Q365 in assigning it to Tov and White (Crawford), with his preliminary description of "a wildly aberrant biblical text;" see Ben Zion Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran. The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness* (Monographs of the Hebrew Union College 8; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1983), 205-6. Michael O. Wise (*A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11* [Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilizations 49; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990], 50, 58-59) suggests that this fragment belongs to a "proto-Temple scroll." Hartmut Stegemann ("The Origins of the Temple Scroll," in *Congress Volume Jerusalem 1986* [ed. John A. Emerton; VTSup 40; Leiden: Brill, 1986], 237, 253) argues that the fragment is indeed a part of 4QRP, but that this composition must have been a source for the *Temple Scroll*. More recently, Florentino García Martínez (New Perspectives on the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Perspectives in the Study of the Old Testament and Early Judaism* [ed. Florentino García Martínez and Edward Noort; VTSup 73; Leiden: Brill, 1998], 245) suggests that the document is part of 4Q365, though he hesitates to speculate on the exact relationship with the *Temple Scroll*. After their extensive study of 4QRP, Tov and White (Crawford) give the most persuasive defense of placing fragment 23 with the rest of 4Q365 based on the direct reference to Moses (unlike the *Temple Scroll*), the absence of direct textual overlap and a crease in fragment 23 at the precise angle of a crease in 4Q365 12b iii. For a comprehensive argument on placing fragment 23 within the rest of 4Q365; see Tov and White (Crawford), *Qumran Cave 4.VIII*, 293-96; also White Crawford, "Three Fragments," 261-65.

(26) Before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, several scholars, most notably R.H. Charles (*The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books* [2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913] 2. 831-32), identified this citation of *Jubilees* based



yond their similar genre of rewritten pentateuchal text. The above-mentioned allusion to the wood festival in 4Q365 23 likely refers to a specific passage in *Jubilees*, “Be careful about the (kinds of) woods (that are used for) sacrifice so that you bring no (kinds of) woods onto the altar except these only: cypress, silver-fir, almond...of these (kinds of) woods place beneath the sacrifice on the altar ones that have been tested for their appearance.” (27) The passage continues to describe other qualifications for the wood of the altar, then an exhortation to “Pay attention to this commandment and do it, my son, so that you may behave properly in all your actions.” (28) Thus, the explicit reference to the wood festival appears to unify 4QRP, the *Temple Scroll* and *Jubilees* against the MT pentateuchal tradition.

Most significantly, in two distinct places, 4QRP shows particular concern with expanding the role of Israel’s patriarchs in a way similar to *Jubilees*. First, the additions of 4Q364 3 ii.5-6 contain material parallel to *Jub* 27:13-18 concerning Jacob’s departure from his parents:

4Q364 3 ii.5-6

1. him you shall see...
2. *you shall see in peace*...
3. your death and to your eyes [...lest I be deprived of even] (29)
4. the two of you. And he [Isaac] called [to Rebekah his wife and told]
5. her all [these] wor[ds]...
6. after Jacob her son [and she cried... (30)]

*Jub* 27:13-18

After Jacob had set out to go to Mesopotamia, Rebecca grieved for her son and kept crying. Isaac said to Rebecca, ‘My sister, do not cry for my son Jacob because he will go safely and return safely. The most high God will guard him from every evil and will be with him because he will not abandon him throughout his entire lifetime. For I well know that his ways will be directed favorably wherever he goes until he returns safely to us and *we see him in peace*. Do not be afraid for him, my sister, because he is just in his way. He is perfect; he is a true man. He

on the Cairo Geniza fragments of the *Damascus Document*. A fragment of 4Q228 also makes an explicit reference to *Jubilees*; James C. VanderKam and Jozef T. Milik, “4QText with a Citation of *Jubilees*” in *Qumran Cave 4 VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (ed. Harold Attridge et al.; DJD 13; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 177-86. For a recent contrarian viewpoint on this citation, see Deborah Dimant (“Two ‘Scientific Fictions’: The So-Called Book of Noah and the Alleged Quotation of *Jubilees* in CD 16:3-4,” in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint* [ed. Peter W. Flint et al.; VTSup 101; Leiden: Brill, 2006], 230-49).

(27) *Jub* 21:12-14; unless noted all *Jubilees* translations from James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*, 2 vols, (Lovanii: E. Peeters, 1989).

(28) *Jub* 21:15.

(29) Lacuna reconstructed by *Gen* 27:45.

(30) Tov and White (Crawford), *Qumran Cave 4.VIII*, 207.

will not be abandoned. Do not cry.’ So Isaac was consoling Rebecca regarding her son Jacob, and he blessed him. (31)

Such an addition of biblical text does not exist in any known textual witness to Genesis. This material does not have any explicit ideological function, though it gives a personal, emotional element to the farewell to Jacob. Instead of the silent husband of the MT, Isaac in both *4QRP* and *Jubilees* comforts his grieving wife. Betsy Halpern-Amaru suggests that *Jubilees* consistently carries this theme of a deeper emotional bond between patriarch and matriarch. (32) Regardless of the function, this overlap prompted White (Crawford) to initially consider *Jubilees* as a potential source for *4QRP*. (33) More recently, she decides that the opposite appears more probable — that *4QRP* served as source material for the authoritative *Jubilees*. (34)

Second, *4QRP* makes note to emphasize Sarah in the genealogical record of Isaac, inserting the phrase יִאֲשֶׁר יְלִידָהּ לֹו שְׂרָה אִשְׁתּוֹ (‘‘whom Sarah, his wife, [bore] to him’’) between the mention of Abraham as Isaac’s father and his age of forty years. (35) As in the case of the other additions, the Qumran copyist inserted this line without any indication that this expansion was peripheral to the actual text. This detail highlights the importance of matrilineal descent as the genealogical role of Sarah receives equal attention as Abraham. James VanderKam shows that such matrilineal concern also appears in *Jubilees* to prove the purity of the chosen line and the negative consequences when a person married outside of that line. (36) *4QRP*’s identification of Sarah as ‘‘Abraham’s wife’’ matches well with her role in *Jubilees*, as Halpern-Amaru writes, ‘‘The rewriting demonstrates a particular concern for the characterization of Sarah. Responding to the multiple roles attributed to her by the *Genesis* writer, *Jubilees* emphasizes a single identity by repeatedly identifying her as ‘the wife of Abraham.’’’ (37) This addition to *Genesis* 25:20 is particularly significant in that it forms the crucial connecting verse between Abraham and the Isaac / Jacob narratives. Thus, Sarah’s expansion in *4QRP* parallels the redactional strategy of *Jubilees* concerning women in the biblical text.

(31) Tov and White (Crawford), *Qumran Cave 4.VIII*, 207 point out this connection. VanderKam translates the literal Ethiopic phrase ‘‘we see him in peace’’ into ‘‘he is safe,’’ VanderKam, *Jubilees*, 2.173.

(32) Betsy Halpern-Amaru, *The Empowerment of Women in the Book of Jubilees* (SJSJ 60; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 60.

(33) White (Crawford), ‘‘4Q364 & 365: A Preliminary Report,’’ 219.

(34) White Crawford, ‘‘Rewritten Bible,’’ 188-89.

(35) *4Q364* 1a-b:3.

(36) James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*. (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001), 114-15.

(37) Halpern-Amaru, *Empowerment of Women*, 48.

These similarities are particularly noteworthy since most appropriations of biblical women in the Second Temple period, and even post-Second Temple literature are not expansive but rather reductive! (38) Even in *Jubilees*, Eileen Schuller notes that the expansive material concentrates on the matriarchs, yet practically ignores the women of the exodus. (39) In light of the strong closeness between *4QRP* and *Jubilees*, one must include both works as part of a larger body of texts that seem to have influenced the community's thinking in both its formation as well as in its later development.

## 5. Qumran Scribal Practice

The proto-sectarian evidence of *4QRP* merits consideration of its scribal features. Specifically, *4QRP* uses standard Qumran orthography and morphology in contrast to the biblical texts of the Samaritans and the Masoretes. (40)

- *4QRP* spells the independent personal pronoun הַמָּה twice and never uses the short form הָהֵם. (41) In both cases, the MT and the Samaritan Pentateuch use הָהֵם.
- *4QRP* has seven uses of the long form הוֹאִה, replacing the short form הוּא in the MT and Samaritan Pentateuch. (42) There are only two certain examples of the short form in *4QRP*. (43)
- *4QRP* has two uses of the long form הִיאָה, and one use of the short form הִיא. (44)

(38) See studies by Theodore Friedman, "The Shifting Role of Women, From the Bible to the Talmud," *Judaism* 36 (1987), 479-87; Tal Ilan, *Integrating Women into Second Temple History* (TSAJ 76; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999); Eileen Schuller, "Women of the Exodus in Biblical Retellings of the Second Temple Period," in *Gender and Difference in Ancient Israel* (ed. Peggy Day; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 178-95.

(39) As a whole, *Jubilees* certainly commits more space to *Genesis* traditions, but even in concise summation, *Jubilees* devotes substantial material to expanding the *Exodus* account of Moses' father, Amran (46:9-10; 47:1; 47:9); see Schuller, "Women of the Exodus," 183. This expansive tendency in *4QRP* and *Jubilees* does not necessarily translate into an "empowerment" of women, nor any sort of nascent biblical feminism. More likely, a high concern with purity through genealogical lineage motivates these additions.

(40) Though the determination of Qumran scribal practice is controversial, this paper accepts Emanuel Tov's methodology for identifying specific Qumran scribal features; see Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004).

(41) *4Q365* 35 ii.2; *4Q365* 2.9.

(42) *4Q364* 24a-24c i.6; *4Q365* 12b iii.6; *4Q365* 32.5; *4Q365* 32.6 (2x); *4Q365* 32.7; *4Q365* 32.14.

(43) *4Q364* 26b i.3; *4Q365* 7 ii.2; a possible short form appears in *4Q367* 3 i.7 though the letter is broken.

(44) *4Q365* 32.5; *4Q365* 32.7; short form appears in *4Q367* 3.11.

- *4QRP* uses the adverbial particle שמה five times versus twice without the final *he*. (45) In the five long instances, both the MT and the Samaritan Pentateuch use the short form שם.
- *4QRP* has three examples of the long form אבִּירוֹ. The short form never appears in *4QRP*. The MT and the Samaritan Pentateuch use the short form. (46)
- *4QRP* exclusively uses אֲשֶׁר and never the colloquial –ש even within the nonbiblical material. (47)

In his recent comprehensive study on Qumran scribal practices, Tov classifies the main scrolls of *4QRP* as products of the Qumran scribal schools according to these orthographic characteristics, along with other categories such as correction systems, guide dots, scribal interventions and intervention frequencies. (48) The assertion of

(45) Two of these long-spelling examples have the final *he* partially reconstructed with reasonable certainty considering the spacing (*4Q365* 6a, 6c ii.11; *4Q365* 32.11), the other examples have a fully legible *he* (*4Q364* 27.4; *4Q364* 30.6; *4Q365* 31a-31c.6). Both examples of the short spelling are questionably reconstructed (*4Q364* 17.1; *4Q365* 32.13).

(46) *4Q364* 11.4; *4Q364* 31.1; *4Q365* H.1.

(47) For example, *4Q364* 1a-1b.3; *4Q364* 30.2. These orthographic techniques are similar to many other texts in Qumran, but this in itself is ideologically significant. William Schniedewind's ("Qumran Hebrew as Antilanguage," *JBL* 118 [1999]: 235-52) theory of Qumran Hebrew as antilanguage explains these orthographic variances in terms of sociolinguistics. He draws on the work of anthropological linguists to show that orthography, forms and script can have ideological meaning. Thus, in the attempt at adding hyper-classicisms as elongated forms, the Qumran community sees itself as going back to the language of God, and against the standard oral vernacular. As a corollary, the Pharisees, who adhered to oral law as authoritative, wrote their sacred texts in spoken vernacular, later appearing in written form as Mishnaic Hebrew. Schniedewind gives a more comprehensive list of Qumran Hebrew features that signal antilanguage besides orthography such as avoidance of Aramaisms and colloquial speech, classicizing tendencies such as the 3mp imperfect form יִקְטִילוּ, and code words. In a para-scriptural work like *4QRP*, orthography is the best signal for antilanguage since it can appear in both the biblical and non-biblical text; see also William M. Schniedewind, "Linguistic Ideology in Qumran Hebrew," in *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* (ed. Takamitsu Muraoka and John Elwolde; STDJ 26; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 245-55; Jan Joosten, "The Knowledge and Use of Hebrew in the Hellenistic Period: Qumran and the Septuagint," *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* (ed. Takamitsu Muraoka and John Elwolde; STDJ 26; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 115-30.

(48) Specific characteristics of *4QRP* scribal format include guide dots, paleo-Hebrew spelling of the Divine Name, dicolon before the Divine Name, large writing blocks, regular margins, replacement letters above cancellation dots, nonfinal forms in final position, spaces between successive books, stichographic layout for poetic texts. Whereas Tov asserts *4Q364-4Q365* and *4Q158* to reflect Qumran scribal traditions, he dismisses *4Q366-4Q367* as literary compositions from outside the community. However, the fragmentary nature of the latter two manuscripts prevents any definitive conclusions. For example, *4Q366-4Q367* does not have a single, clear intact instance of either a long or short form of הוּאֵ, אֲבִי, אֲחִי, שֵׁם or הֵם; see Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 277-83.

Qumran provenance is significant because Tov admits to the creative nature of scribal activity in Qumran, "Many scribes actually took an active role in the shaping of the final form of the text." (49) Certainly, one can expect such scribal additions and edits, though seemingly minor, to reflect the sectarian usage of the community. In fact, Tov observes that most of the biblical and nonbiblical texts show a large amount of scribal intervention. (50) This closer look at the scribal practices of *4QRP* compels Tov to shift his view from the initial publication, and classify *4QRP* as a possible sectarian work. (51) Therefore, in light of the arguments for Qumran Hebrew as anti-language, the long spellings and attempts of archaisms within the text support a particular ideology. The Qumran scribal characteristics support the use of textual reworkings, which reflect a proto-sectarian ideology. (52)

## 6. Additional Considerations and Broader Implications

Two additional considerations deserve merit. First, the extant manuscripts make up a miniscule portion of the entire scroll, which covers the complete Pentateuch. On the basis of the ratio between known fragments and the length of the MT, John Strugnell estimates the completed document of *4QRP* to reach twenty-five meters, and Tov more cautiously suggests from twenty-two to twenty-seven meters. (53) Considering so much lost text, the argument of silence is not particularly compelling in declaring the non-sectarian nature of the scroll. In other words, the fact that *4QRP* does not have an explicit addition comparable to the Samaritan Pentateuch's extra-biblical commandment to build an altar at Mount Gerizim does not disqualify the document as a strictly non-sectarian work. Second, the idea of sectarian variants in scriptural or para-scriptural works is itself problematic. Eugene Ulrich recognizes that if a particular Second Temple group deliberately edited a scriptural text to advance their own ideology, other groups could immediately refute these claims: "This does not mean, of course, that no ancient scribe ever made a sectarian variant; but it does mean that intentional sectarian-moti-

(49) Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 8.

(50) Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 253.

(51) Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 272.

(52) In critiquing Tov's methodological approach, D.H. Kim ("Free Orthography in a Strict Society: Reconsidering Tov's 'Qumran Orthography,'" *DSD* 11 [2004]: 72-81) calls for a more fluid understanding of orthographic practice in Qumran scribal schools based on the short spellings of the sectarian works, *Manual of Discipline* (4Q258, 4Q264) and the *Damascus Document* (4Q270). Yet Kim still recognizes that, "The majority of sectarian scrolls were written in what Tov calls, 'Qumran orthography.'"

(53) Tov and White (Crawford), *Qumran Cave 4.VIII*, 192.

vated alteration of Scripture would not be a problem-free action and therefore that a scholar making such claim would need clear and thorough-going proof.” (54) Accordingly, these subtle scribal variants in *4QRP* fit the late Second Temple context of a group attempting to find legitimacy among the multiple strands of Judaism.

Therefore, the preliminary assertion of *4QRP* as non-sectarian, and merely another textual strand requires further investigation and modification. Suspicious textual emendations, affinities with the *Temple Scroll* and *Jubilees* and evidence of Qumran scribal practice suggest some degree of sectarian influence in *4QRP*. On a broader scale, this study implies that a clear division between sectarian and non-sectarian documents simply does not exist. As sociologists have demonstrated, describing a sect is not a straightforward matter and better done along a scale of multiple dimensions. (55) Accordingly, instead of pointing to the two extremes of sectarian and non-sectarian, it may be more helpful to look at a continuum based on how much of the Qumran ideology makes its way into each particular text. (56) A more complex paradigm undoubtedly requires more effort, but will better account for the study of variants within the biblical texts at Qumran and their relation with the other manuscripts and the sect. In other words, today’s scholars will have to navigate between the sacredness of the texts and ideologies of the particular community, much like the Qumran scribes when they learned how to rewrite Torah.

Roger S. NAM

(54) Eugene Ulrich, “The Absence of ‘Sectarian Variants’ in Jewish Scriptural Scrolls Found at Qumran,” in *The Bible as a Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (ed. Edward Herbert and Emanuel Tov; London: The British Library and Oak Knoll Press, 2002), 181.

(55) Jokiranta, “Sectarianism,” 228-31.

(56) Recent studies place *4QRP* in the middle of a continuum in terms of both its biblical status and its authoritative nature; for the former, see Molly Zahn, “The Status of 4QReworked Pentateuch: Methods and Limitations,” 2006 Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting (Washington D.C.); for the latter, see Dwight D. Swanson, “How Scriptural Is Re-Written Bible?” *RdQ* 83 (2004): 407-27.