CHAPTER SIX

REWRITTEN BIBLE COMPOSITIONS AND BIBLICAL MANUSCRIPTS,
WITH SPECIAL ATTENTION PAID TO THE
SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH

1. *Background*

This study addresses the question of the fine line between biblical
manuscripts and rewritten Bible texts, and in so doing we turn not only
to matters of definition, but also to features common to these two types
of texts.

The defining of the biblical manuscripts and rewritten Bible
compositions should not be difficult in theory since the two groups of
texts seem to be easily distinguishable from one another. However, in
practice the distinction is difficult. A biblical *manuscript* has an
authoritative status as Scripture, even if the manuscript is replete with
exegetical changes (additions, omissions) vis-à-vis earlier texts, whereas
a rewritten Bible *composition* does not constitute an authoritative biblical
text, but rather a new composition based on the Bible. However, the
distinction between these two groups remains difficult since it at times it
is hard to establish a manuscript's authoritative status. It is not the
amount of exegesis or deviation from MT that counts, but the purpose
behind the writing of the manuscript under investigation. Thus, the
various texts of Jeremiah (MT, the *Vorlage* of the LXX, Qumran texts from
caves 2 and 4) are biblical, and in spite of the major differences among
them, they remain within the biblical realm. The exact relation between
the different manuscripts is subject to constant discussion among
scholars, but all agree that these are biblical texts. Thus, the pre-
Samaritan texts and SP reflect much content exegesis vis-à-vis the earlier
texts, and they constitute a greatly edited text. However, they were
considered authoritative by the Samaritan community as well as the
Qumran community, whose writings were sometimes based on them
(4QTest and 4QJub). Likewise, the proto-Masoretic texts, which
contained only a low level of exegesis vis-à-vis earlier texts, had an
authoritative status in Temple circles from a certain period onwards (see

chapter 12*). By the same token, the Hebrew compositions translated by the LXX translators such as 1 Kings and Esther were considered authoritative by these translators and by the community in which they lived. Likewise, the Greek translation itself enjoyed such an authoritative status.[1]

This leads to the question of how to distinguish between authoritative biblical texts reflecting content exegesis, and texts that are no longer considered biblical. How do we define a manuscript that resembles a biblical text but was not considered authoritative? The dividing line between biblical and nonbiblical texts was not as fixed as we would like to believe. Three types of non-authoritative texts have a close relation to Hebrew Scripture and can easily be confused with Scripture texts.

a. *Liturgical texts* composed of biblical sections or combinations of biblical and nonbiblical sections are rather numerous among the Qumran texts. The best-known examples are 11QPs[a] and such Torah texts as 4QDeut[n] and 4QDeut[j].[2]

b. *Abbreviated and excerpted* biblical texts were prepared for special purposes that are not always clear to us. Some of these collections were liturgical, such as the previously mentioned group. Others probably reflected a literary preference, such as 4QDeut[q] that contains only the song of Deuteronomy 32, and the abbreviated texts of Canticles contained in two excerpted manuscripts, 4QCant[a,b].[3]

c. *Rewritten Bible texts* are newly created literary compositions that to a great extent overlap with biblical manuscripts. The definition of what constitutes a rewritten Bible text is less clear now than it was a few years ago. Before the Qumran texts were found, scholars were aware of a series of rewritten biblical texts of very diverse nature. Foremost among them is the book of Jubilees. Pseudo-Philo created another rewritten text, as did Josephus in his rewritten story of Hebrew Scripture in *Jewish Antiquities*. Beyond these texts, we now know from Qumran an additional group of rewritten Bible texts, all fragmentary, ranging from compositions changing the biblical text only minimally to those compositions in which the substratum of the biblical text is only seldom visible, since the text was completely rewritten. Each composition is a unicum with regard to its approach to the Bible and the act of rewriting. The second half of 11QT[a] (cols. LI–LXVI) only changed the biblical text to a small extent (see chapter 2*), while a much greater degree of change is visible in the Jubilees texts from cave 4, 4QExposition on the Patriarchs

---

[1] On all these issues, see chapter 20* and Tov, "Many Forms."
[2] See chapter 4*.
[3] See ibid.

(4Q464), 4QCommGen (4Q252–254a), and in the various compositions that have the component "apocryphon" or "pseudo-" as part of their title (see *DJD* XIII, XIX, XXII).

A major question that needs to be asked with regard to these rewritten texts is whether or to what extent their writers or readers considered them to be authoritative biblical texts. The modern nomenclature "rewritten biblical text" seems to exclude the possibility that these texts were considered authoritative, but we are not certain that this was the case in each instance.[4] Possibly the author or readers of such a text, or both, considered the rewritten text to be authoritative, for example Jubilees and 11QT$^a$. This possibility can neither be proven nor disproved, but there is nothing intrinsically wrong with the assumption that one or more of the mentioned texts were considered as authoritative as texts that we consider to be authoritative biblical manuscripts. It has, for example, been noticed that in the Qumran community writings, the books of the Torah and most of the books of the Prophets are quoted as authoritative Scripture,[5] together with some of the Hagiographa, and the book of Jubilees. That book is quoted expressly in CD 16:2–3: "As for the exact determination of their times to which Israel turns a blind eye, behold it is strictly defined in the *Book of the Divisions of the Times into their Jubilees and Weeks*."[6] Besides, fifteen or sixteen copies of this book have been found at Qumran, thus proving that it was popular among the Qumranites. The book is written as authoritative Scripture, with God announcing Israel's future to Moses on Sinai. A similar claim of authority is implicit in the Temple Scroll, in which Israel's laws are rewritten according to biblical pericopes, and Deuteronomy is rewritten in cols. LI–LXVI. It refers to God in the first person thereby lending greater authority to its contents, as compared with the third person used in the Bible. The book is known from five Qumran manuscripts (three

---

[4] For a discussion, see M. J. Bernstein, "'Rewritten Bible': A Generic Category Which Has Outlived its Usefulness?," *Textus* 22 (2005) 169–96 (p. 181: "One person's reworked Bible is another's Bible"); F. García Martínez, "Las fronteras de 'lo Bíblico'," *Scripta Theologica* 23 (1991–1993) 759–84; J. G. Campbell, "'Rewritten Bible' and 'Parabiblical Texts': A Terminological and Ideological Critique," in *New Directions in Qumran Studies: Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 8-10th September 2003* (ed. J. G. Campbell et al.; Library of Second Temple Studies 52; London: T & T Clark International, 2005) 43–68.

[5] For a useful table of these references, see J. C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1994) 151–2. For a longer list and an innovative analysis, see A. Lange, "From Literature to Scripture—The Unity and Plurality of the Hebrew Scriptures in Light of the Qumran Library," in *Canon from Biblical, Theological, and Philosophical Perspectives* (ed. C. Helmer and C. Landmesser; Oxford: University Press, 2004) 51–107.

[6] See VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, 154 (see n. 5).

from cave 11, and two from cave 4),[7] a number that is probably large enough to assume its popularity at Qumran. It is less clear whether this composition is quoted in the Qumran writings, unless the enigmatic *Sefer he-Hagu* refers to this work.[8]

Against this background, this chapter focuses on the rewriting in some of the authoritative manuscripts of the Bible. We focus on the Torah, because the ancients were more active in the Torah than in the other books.[9]

The rewriting in the pre-Samaritan texts and SP (henceforth: the SP group) has been stressed less in the discussion of rewritten Bible texts. This aspect is analyzed in detail in the following discussion.

## 2. *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Pre-Samaritan Texts*

While the rewritten Bible texts inserted new elements into the previously known biblical text, the SP group copied existing biblical passages in new locations. In order to highlight the differences between the two types of texts, this feature of the SP group is analyzed here in detail.

Since the pre-Samaritan texts are known only fragmentarily, the analysis of the SP group focuses on SP, with constant reference to the pre-Samaritan texts from Qumran. This procedure is legitimate, since in their editorial changes the members of the SP group are almost identical (see below, § 3). The extensive content editing of the SP group has been analyzed at length by Tigay as background material for the analysis of the documentary hypothesis of the Torah.[10] It is equally relevant to compare SP with the rewritten biblical texts, since the changes of SP that have been presented as harmonizing changes should actually be conceived of as exponents of content editing.[11] This type of editing, which is a form of rewriting, is discussed next, while the following two *caveats* should be kept in mind:

---

[7] 11QT[a,b,c], 4Q365a, and 4Q524.

[8] 4QReworked Pentateuch, published as a rewritten Bible text, probably should be reclassified as an exegetical biblical text and hence need not be mentioned in this context. See chapter 20*, § E and Tov, "Many Forms."

[9] See my study "The Scribal and Textual Transmission of the Torah Analyzed in Light of Its Sanctity," forthcoming.

[10] J. H. Tigay, "Conflation as a Redactional Technique," in idem, *Empirical Models*, 53–96.

[11] Harmonizing is indeed an important aspect of the SP group, which adapted several details in the same or parallel stories; see *TCHB*, 88. These harmonizing readings have been considered so central by some scholars, that E. Eshel used this term to characterize the SP group as a whole ("harmonistic texts"), see E. Eshel, "4QDeut[n]—A Text That Has Undergone Harmonistic Editing," *HUCA* 62 (1991) 117–54.

a. In its present form, SP is a sectarian text incorporating the Samaritan belief in the site of Mount Gerizim as the central place of worship. This belief is expressed by the addition of a tenth, "Samaritan" commandment to the Decalogue, enabled by the moving of the first commandment to the Decalogue preamble,[12] and a small change in the centralization formula in the book of Deuteronomy.[13] The sectarian nature of SP seemingly prohibits its objective analysis within the present analysis, but when this very slight sectarian layer is removed, its underlying base can easily be recognized as a pre-sectarian text.

b. The pre-Samaritan Qumran texts are known only fragmentarily, although the preserved fragments give us good insights into the shape of Exodus and Numbers, the two most important books for the content rewriting of these texts. The two best-preserved texts, 4QpaleoExod[m] and 4QNum[b], are relatively extensive, and in fact the former is one of the best-preserved biblical texts from Qumran; 4QExod-Lev[f] is less extensively preserved. The pre-Samaritan text was also used by 4QTest and 4QJub, rendering our knowledge of this group rather firm.

In their major characteristics, the pre-SP texts and SP usually agree against all other textual witnesses (see below, § 3). For the sake of convenience, the analysis will therefore focus on the only complete text in this group, SP, with constant reference to the preserved readings of the pre-SP texts.

We now turn to the central characteristics of the texts under discussion:

a. The SP group reflects a great amount of content editing.

b. The editing involved is of a specific nature, meant to impart a more perfect and internally consistent structure to the text.

c. The editing is inconsistent, that is, certain details were changed, while others, similar in nature, were left untouched.

When trying to formulate the areas in which the SP group inserted changes, we note that the editor was especially attentive to what he

---

[12] The commandment is made up entirely of verses occurring elsewhere in the Torah: Deut 11:29a, Deut 27:2b-3a, Deut 27:4a, Deut 27:5-7, Deut 11:30—in that sequence in the SP (Exodus and Deuteronomy). The addition includes the reading of the SP in Deut 27:4 "Mount Gerizim" instead of "Mount Ebal" as in most other texts as the name of the place where the Israelites were commanded to erect their altar after crossing the Jordan.

[13] This change pertains to the frequent Deuteronomic formulation המקום אשר יבחר יהוה, "the site which the Lord *will* choose." This reference to an anonymous site in Palestine actually envisioned Jerusalem, but that city could not be mentioned in Deuteronomy since it had not yet been conquered at the time of Moses' discourse. From the Samaritan perspective, however, Shechem had already been chosen at the time of the patriarchs (Gen 12:6; Gen 33:18-20), so that the future form "*will* choose" needed to be changed to a past form בחר, "*has* chosen." See, e.g., Deut 12:5, 14.

considered to be imperfections within units and between units. What disturbed the editor especially was the incongruence— according to a formalistic view of Scripture—between details within and between specific stories. In this regard, special attention was paid to the presentation of the spoken word, especially by God, which was repeated when the reviser considered it important.

i. *The story of the ten plagues*. In this story, the SP group harmonized the description of God's commands to Moses and Aaron to warn Pharaoh before each plague by adding a detailed account of their execution. Systematic additions of the execution of these commands are found in Exodus 7–11.[14] These additions are not exclusive to these texts, as shown, for example, by a similar addition in LXX[Luc] and the Peshitta in 1 Sam 9:3.

ii. *Moses' summarizing speech in Deuteronomy 1–3*. With pedantic precision, the editor compared the details of this speech with the preceding books of the Torah and, where needed, added them in Exodus and Numbers according to a very precise framework of interpretation. For a detailed analysis, see below.

iii. The *genealogical framework of Genesis 11* was streamlined by the addition of summaries of the number of years that each person lived.

iv. *The Decalogue*. Beyond the addition of a further commandment (see n. 12 above), SP (thus also 4QRP[a] [4Q158] and 4QTest) added a section of laws (Deut 18:15-22) to the account in Deuteronomy that expressly mentioned the giving of that specific law at Sinai (named Horeb in Deuteronomy).

v. Sundry *small segments* were inserted in the text in order to perfect the framework of certain stories.[15]

At the same time, the text could have been exegetically changed in a similar fashion in many additional pericopes that were *not* reworked. It is hard to know why certain units were altered as described above, while others were not, and the only explanation for this phenomenon is the personal taste of the editor. A major area in which the text was not touched is that of the laws, which were, as a rule, not harmonized to one another. Thus, differences between parallel laws were not canceled by harmonizing additions or changes. As in the rabbinic tradition, these differences were accepted as referring to different situations.

---

[14] It is characteristic of the style of the biblical narrative to relate commands in great detail, while their fulfillment is mentioned only briefly, with the words ". . . and he (etc.) did as . . ." Often in the SP, the execution of such commands is also elaborated on with a repetition of the details of the command. These additions reflect the editorial desire to stress that the command had indeed been carried out. For examples, see chapter 20*, n. 103.

[15] For examples, see *TCHB*, 88.

By the same token, the second part of Moses' speech in Deuteronomy, chapters 4–11, was not treated in the same way as the first part. While each statement in chapters 1–3 was scrutinized and, when considered necessary, repeated in Exodus and Numbers, this was not done for Deut 5:19-30 nor for the details in chapter 9 with the exception of 9:20, repeated in SP and 4QpaleoExod^m in Exod 32:10.

Likewise, in many individual stories no attention was paid to the exact matching of a command with its execution, as was done in the beginning chapters of Exodus. For example, the command at the beginning of Genesis 22 was not repeated in the form of an action. It is unclear why the story of Exodus 7–11 was singled out for such extensive editing. It may well be that the already schematic framework of these chapters encouraged the reviser to greater perfection, while in most other cases such a framework was lacking. However, by the same token, the creation story could have been made more symmetrical in SP by adding the exact execution of each of God's commands.

3. *The Reworking of Deuteronomy 1–3 in the SP Group*

Together with the story of Exodus 7–11, Moses' first speech in Deuteronomy 1–3 was the single most central issue on which the editor of the SP group focused. Each item in that speech was scrutinized, and if it did not occur explicitly in Exodus or Numbers, it was repeated in the earlier books as foreshadowers of Deuteronomy. The details are recorded in the following table.[16]

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

---

[16] The numbering system of the added verses in the SP follows the editions of Tal, *Samaritan Pentateuch* and A. F. von Gall, *Der hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner*, vols. I–V (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1914–1918). In both editions, the added verses were given additional numbers, but not in that of Sadaqa, in which the additional verses were marked typographically by printing in a larger font: Sadaqa, *Jewish and Samaritan Version*. According to the additional number system, the additional verse is denoted below as "b," and the existing one as "a," e.g. Num 10:10a in the edition of the SP equals 10:10 of MT, while 10:b is the additional verse of the SP (that is, a plus in the SP based on the MT of Deut 1:6-8). We follow Tal's numbering system that differs in one detail from that of von Gall. In the latter edition, in some cases the additional verse was named "a" when it preceded an existing verse named "b." Thus, in von Gall's edition, the added verse in the SP to Num 14:41a (= MT of Deut 1:42) has been placed before 14:42 which was named 14:42b.

| Deut | Source (speech indicated by italics) | Topic | Found elsewhere in Torah | Added elsewhere in SP | Addition in Qumran texts[17] | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1:1-5 | Introduction | Geographic description | — | — | | |
| 1:6-8 | *Divine speech on Horeb* | The Israelites to leave immediately to conquer Canaan | — | Num 10:10b | | Just before the Israelites left Horeb / Sinai |
| 1:9-18 | *Moses* | Appointment of judges | Exod 18 | Exod 18:24b, 25b | 4Qpaleo-Exod^m | Duplicates 18:17-26, though not formally |
| 1:19 | | Travel description | — | — | | |
| 1:20-23a | *Moses* | Sending of spies | Num 13 | Num 12:16b (before 13:1) | [4QNum^b] | Duplicates Num 13, though not formally |
| 1:23b-26 | | Sending of spies | Num 13 | — | | |
| 1:27-28 | *People* | Complaint about results of spies' mission | Num 14 | Num 13:33b (before 14:1) | | Duplicates Num 14 |
| 1:29-33 | *Moses* | Answer to complaint | — | Num 13:33b (before 14:1) | | Duplicates Num 14 |
| 1:34-40 | *Divine* | Peoples' punishment | Num 14:20-35 | — | | |
| 1:41 | *People* | Israelites ascend mountain to fight | Num 14:40 | — | | |
| 1:42 | *Divine* | Israelites told not to fight | Num 14:42-43 | Num 14:40b | | Duplicates Num 14:42-43, though not formally |
| 1:43-44a | | Battle details | Num 14:44-45 | — | | |
| 1:44b | | Battle simile | — | Num 14:45b | | |
| 1:45-46 | | Historical description | Num 20:1 | — | | |
| 2:1 | | Israelites encircle | Num 21:4 | — | | |

---

[17] When this column is empty, no evidence is available for the fragmentary Qumran scrolls. Negative evidence (that is, when a scroll does not reflect an addition found in the SP) is indicated explicitly. Reconstructed evidence is included in square brackets.

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Edom | | | |
| 2:2-6 | *Divine* | Israelites told to pass through Edom | — | Num 20:13b | 4QNum[b] |
| 2:7 | *Divine* | (Same topic continued) | — | [not in SP] | (not in 4QNum[b]) |
| 2:8 | | Israelites move to Moab | Num 21:11 | — | |
| 2:9 | *Divine* | Israelites told not to trouble Moab | — | Num 21:11b | 4QNum[b] |
| 2:10-12 | | Historical digression | — | — | |
| 2:13 | *Divine* | Israelites told to pass Zered | Num 21:12 | — | |
| 2:14-16 | | Historical digression | — | — | |
| 2:17-19 | *Divine* | Israelites told not to pass through Ammon | — | Num 21:12b | 4QNum[b] |
| 2:20-23 | | Historical digression | — | — | |
| 2:24-25 | *Divine* | Israelites told to pass over Arnon and start war | — | Num 21:20b | 4QNum[b] |
| 2:26-27 | *People* | Israelites ask to pass through Sihon's territory | Num 21:21-22 | Num 21:22b (partial) | |
| 2:28-29 | *People* | Israelites ask to buy food from Sihon | — | Num 21:22b | [4QNum[b]] |
| 2:30 | | Sihon refused request | Num 21:23 | — | |
| 2:31 | *Divine* | Promise to give Sihon into the Israelites' hands | — | Num 21:23b | [4QNum[b]] |
| 2:32-37 | | Israelites win victory over Moab | Num 21:24-26 | — | |
| 3:1-7 | | Defeat of Og | Num 21:33-35 | — | |
| 3:8-13 | | Historical | Num 21:24- | — | |

| | | digression | 25, 33-35 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3:14-17 | | Territory allotted to two-and-a-half tribes | Num 32:41 | — | |
| 3:18-20 | *Moses* | Two-and-a-half tribes told to assist brethren in Canaan conquest | Num 32: 17,20,21 | — | |
| 3:21-22 | *Moses* | Encouragement to Joshua | — | Num 27:23b | 4QNum[b] |
| 3:23-26 | *Moses* | Request to enter Israel | — | Num 20:13b | |
| 3:27-28 | *Divine* | Negative answer | — | — | |
| 3:29 | | Israelites remain in Beth Pe'or | — | — | |

*Analysis*

The treatment of Deuteronomy 1–3 in the SP group is based on the understanding of its components by the author of that group. With the exception of the first five verses, chapters 1–3 are phrased as a speech by Moses, but within that speech a distinction can be made between:

1. an account of events;
2. direct quote of speeches by Moses;
3. direct quote of speeches by God;
4. historical and geographical digressions.

The reviser of the text in the SP group focused on the first three chapters of Deuteronomy that, in his mind, should have reflected an exact summary of the events and speeches described in the earlier books. Special attention was paid to the spoken words, mostly those of God and Moses, recorded in these three chapters. As a rule, these spoken words are not matched exactly by the stories in Exodus and Numbers, but even if they are somehow reflected, they were repeated in the SP group, which expected a verbatim repetition in the biblical text. Thus, the story of the appointment of the judges (Deut 1:9-18) was repeated in the middle of verses 24 and 25 of Exodus 18 since the details of the two stories differed. In other cases in which the spoken words were not matched by the text of Exodus and Numbers, they were repeated in the appropriate places in these books from Deuteronomy. This pertains to all the spoken words in these chapters, with the exception of Deut 2:7, continuing 2:2-6, and of all other sections that, in the editor's view, did not need to be repeated, that

is the introduction (vv 1-5) and several narrative details that do not contain speeches.[18]

Some of these sections were not repeated, possibly because they were covered somehow by narratives in Exodus and Numbers.

Basically, the editor's technique was to repeat sections from Moses' speech in Deuteronomy in the previous books of the Torah as foreshadowers of Deuteronomy. When the account of Deuteronomy was repeated in the SP of Exodus and Numbers, it often created a peculiar duplication that was rather unusual from a literary point of view. The duplication created is usually not impossible at the content level, as the reviser took care to ascribe the parallel sections to different speakers (e.g., God/Moses), but in one case a rather "impossible" text was created (Num 13:33b together with Numbers 14; see below). Several details are mentioned in the "*Notes*" column in the table as "duplications."[19]

---

[18]

| MT | Topic |
|---|---|
| 1:19 | Travel from Horeb to Qadesh Barnea |
| 1:23b-26 | Sending of the spies |
| 1:43-44a | Details of the battle |
| 1:44b | Simile of the battle |
| 1:45-46 | Historical description |
| 2:1 | The Israelites encircle Edom |
| 2:8 | The Israelites move to Moab |
| 2:10-12 | Historical digression |
| 2:14-16 | Historical digression |
| 2:20-23 | Historical digression |
| 2:30 | Sihon refused request |
| 2:32-37 | The Israelites win a victory over Moab |
| 3:1-7 | Defeat of Og |
| 3:8-13 | Historical digression |
| 3:14-17 | Territory allotted to two-and-a-half tribes |
| 3:29 | The Israelites remain in Beth Pe'or |

[19] *Deut 1:9-18 = Exod 18:24b, 25b SP*.

The two versions of the story of the appointment of the judges in Deuteronomy 1 and Exodus 19 differ in several details:

1. In Exodus, the idea to appoint judges originated with Jethro, while in Deuteronomy it was suggested by Moses.

2. The requirements for the ideal judge differ in the two texts (cf. Exod 19:21 with Deut 1:13); in Exodus they stress ethical virtues, and in Deuteronomy intellectual qualities.

3. The appointment of the judges precedes the theophany at Sinai in Exodus, while in Deuteronomy it follows that event.

On a formal level, the story is not told twice in Exodus 18 in the SP, since the main story of Exodus in that version presents the proposal of Jethro, while the supplement from Deuteronomy relates the executing of Jethro's advice.

*Deut 1:20-23a = Num 12:16b SP*

The added section from Deuteronomy contains Moses' words to the people describing the dispatching of the spies, starting with his command to send them off, and continuing with the people's agreement to the mission. This account runs parallel to the next section in Numbers 13, which starts all over again: God's command to Moses to send spies (13:1-20)

*Sequence*

The reviser took pains to place the repeated sections in exactly the right position in the narrative in Exodus and Numbers. Since Moses' speech in Deuteronomy more or less followed a historical sequence, the reworker's task was not too difficult, but at times his special skills and knowledge of the biblical text are especially noteworthy.

As in other cases, the reviser was especially sensitive to words that, according to the text, had been uttered at Sinai and were not recorded precisely in the present biblical text. Thus, when Deut 1:6-8 says: "The Lord our God spoke to us at Horeb saying: You have stayed long enough at this mountain. Start out and make your way to the hill country of the Amorites . . . ," SP took care to repeat the exact content of these verses in Num 10:10b. The reviser could have repeated this section in Exodus, but he probably wanted to place it in the pericope in which it would be most relevant and powerful, namely before the verses that relate the moving

---

and the executing of the command (13:21-33). On a formal level, there is no duplication, since Deut 1:20-23a = Num 12:16b SP reflects the words of Moses to the people and Num 13:1ff. contains the words of God to Moses.

*Deut 1:27-33 = Num 13:33b SP*

The addition of this section at the end of Numbers 13 created a direct duplication of the content of the next chapter. The addition in Num 13:33b contains the complaints of the Israelites after the gloomy report of the spies (Deut 1:27-28) together with Moses' words of encouragement to the people, stating that God will help them (Deut 1:29-33). However, the next section contains exactly the same episodes: the Israelites complain again (Num 14:1-4), and listen to Moses' reassuring words (Num 14:5-9), as if these episodes had not been described at the end of the previous chapter. This repetition, and hence duplication, created a very unusual situation at the literary level.

*Deut 1: 42 = Num 14:40b SP*

The added verse in the SP of Num, 14:40b, deriving from Deut 1:42, creates a duplication with Num 14:42-43, but on a formal level there is no duplication, since the added verse in SP, 14:40b, reports God's words, while the repetition records Moses' words repeating those of God.

During the course of his reworking, the editor had to change the wording slightly, since in Deuteronomy 1–3, Moses spoke in the first person, while in the other chapters he was often mentioned in the third person. The reviser therefore slightly rewrote the original text, for example:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Source | MT Deut 1:9 | ואמר אלכם |
| Rewritten text | SP Exod 18:24a | ויאמר משה אל העם |
| Source | MT Deut 1:23 | וייטב בעיני הדבר |
| Rewritten text | SP Num 12:16b | וייטב הדבר בעיני משה |

This type of rewriting reminds us of the Temple Scroll, which contains changes in the reverse direction. That text was rephrased in the first person, as if it contains the word of God, rendering it necessary to rephrase all biblical utterances in the third person referring to God in the first person (cf. chapter 2*). For example,

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Source | MT Deut 20:17 | שנה בשנה במקום אשר יבחר יהוה |
| Rewritten text | 11QT$^a$ LII 9 | שנה בשנה במקום אשר אבחר |
| Source | MT Deut 20:17 | כאשר צוך יהוה אלהיך |
| Rewritten text | 11QT$^a$ LXII 15 | כאשר צויתיכה |

from Horeb, viz., vv 11-12 ("In the second year . . . the Israelites set out on their journey from the wilderness of Sinai"). In actual fact, while Deuteronomy speaks of Horeb, Numbers mentions Sinai, but the reviser realized that the same place was intended.[20]

Thus, when following the sequence of the verses in Numbers and Exodus in which the reviser had inserted the duplicated sections, we note in col. 5 of the table that with the exception of the aforementioned Exod 18:25a, he followed the sequence of the chapters in Numbers, with some exceptions.[21]

The reviser knew his biblical text well, and therefore the appointment of the judges (Deut 1:9-18) had to be added out of sequence in Exodus 18. Likewise, the last item in the speech in Deuteronomy 1–3 (Deut 3:23-26), Moses' request to enter Canaan, was repeated in a different place in Numbers, in conjunction with the story of the Waters of Meribah. In Deuteronomy, this request was inserted after the people had finished encircling Edom and had conquered Moab. This is a logical place for the request, just preceding the entering of Canaan. However, in SP a different logic is reflected. In the SP of Num 20:13b, the section is placed after the description of Moses' sin at the Waters of Meribah, where he had shown insufficient trust in the Lord and was therefore punished by not being allowed to enter Canaan. This placement of the addition shows that the editor was a very attentive reader and exegete; he considered this a more appropriate place for Moses' special request.

The preserved fragments of 4QNum[b] and 4QpaleoExod[m] include all the sections repeated in SP in the same places. This evidence is provided in col. 6 of the table. In all instances, the preserved evidence of the two Qumran scrolls agrees with SP, while in three cases, 4QNum[b] can be reconstructed as having contained such an addition. The text of that scroll is well preserved and enables the reconstruction of the number of lines in each column.

The nature of the exegesis behind the addition of the verses in the SP group in Exodus and Numbers is such that it probably ought to be

---

[20] Likewise, on another occasion, when the text of Deut 18:16 read: "This is just what you asked of the Lord your God at Horeb . . . ," the next verses, too, had to be added at an appropriate place in the story since the preserved story actually did not contain this utterance. Indeed, Deut 18:18-22 was repeated appropriately in the heart of the story of the Sinai revelation itself, as Exod 20:18b, though not in Deuteronomy. This section was likewise placed at this point in 4QRP[a] (4Q158), frg. 6, lines 6–9 and 4QTest lines 5–8.

[21] The following additional verses are found in the text of Exodus and Numbers in the SP based on segments derived from Deuteronomy 1–3 (italics indicate special cases): Num 10:10b; *Exod 18:24b, 25b*; Num 12:16b (before 13:1); Num 13:33b (before 14:1); Num 14:40b; Num 14:45b; Num 20:13b; Num 21:11b; Num 21:12b; Num 21:20b; Num 21:22b; Num 21:23b; Num 27:23b; *Num 20:13b*.

conceived of as the work of a single person and not of a school or textual family. The few instances mentioned above, in which the editor deviated from the verse sequence, show the personal involvement of an individual, which is reflected in more than one textual source. It seems that a single text, reflecting the work of an individual, must be assumed at the base of the SP texts.

4. *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Rewritten Bible Compositions*

The so-called rewritten Bible compositions do not form a well-defined group; they have in common a reworking of an existing Scripture text. In the case of the Temple Scroll, this is a text of an independent nature, and in the case of Jubilees, it is a text close to the SP group.[22] Neither the purpose of the reworking nor the *Sitz im Leben* of these texts or their authoritative status is always clear. Some compositions deviate only minimally from the biblical text, while others differ substantially.

In the latter half of the Temple Scroll,[23] long stretches of biblical text are presented with only minor changes from the majority text. In fact, it

---

[22] For the former, see my study "The Temple Scroll and Old Testament Textual Criticism," *ErIsr* 16 (Harry M. Orlinsky Volume) (ed. B. A. Levine and A. Malamat; Heb. with Eng. summ.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society/Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, 1982) 100–11; for the latter, see the argumentation of J. C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (HSM 14; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977) 136–8.

[23] The Temple Scroll contains large sections that provide a running text of Deuteronomy with few differences from MT, e.g., 11QT[a], cols. LX 10–LXIV 6, as well as other stretches of text in which the main difference from the canonical text of the Torah is the deviating internal sequence of 11QT[a], e.g., col. LIII 11–14a (Deut 23:22-24), LIII 14b–21 (Num 30:3-6), LIV 1–5a (Num 30:3-14 [different internal sequence]), LIV 5b–21 (Deut 13:1-7), LV 1–14 (Deut 13:13-19), LV 15–21 (Deut 17:2-5), LVI 1–21 (Deut 17:9-18). The various biblical texts are linked to one another by principles of associative connection, as if they reflected an exegetical chain of legal prescriptions. See G. Brin, "Concerning Some of the Uses of the Bible in the Temple Scroll," *RevQ* 12 (1987) 519–28. If, as M. O. Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11* (SAOC 49; Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1990) believes, the mentioned sections in 11QT[a] belonged to a separate source preceding the Temple Scroll, that source would be the closest among the reworked biblical compositions to the biblical text. However, the Temple Scroll also contains sections that consist of a combination of two or more different Torah laws pertaining to a specific issue. For example, col. LII 1–5a combines elements from both Deut 16:22–17:1 and Lev 26:22 with reference to the prohibition of idols, with Deuteronomy serving as the leading text. Furthermore, the Temple Scroll rewrites the content of the biblical text from time to time, freely condensing the often verbose text of Deuteronomy, and altering some of its ideas, such as col. LIII 2–8 rephrasing Deut 12:20-28 and 15-19 and col. XXV 10–12 rephrasing Lev 23:27-29; see further chapter 2*.

is often almost impossible to decide whether small fragments found at Qumran contained a biblical text or a rewritten biblical composition.[24]

The main focus of this study is an analysis of the SP group as a rewritten Bible text. The analysis shows that the distinction between the various texts is difficult, since the SP group displays all the features of a rewritten Bible text, yet has been accepted among the authoritative Scripture texts. What the rewritten Bible compositions and the SP group have in common is the interaction of stretches of Scripture text with exegetical expansions, although these expansions differ in nature and tendency. An early rewritten Bible text, Chronicles, was included in the Hebrew and Greek canon. Not all communities accepted some of these literary reformulations. Thus, some of them made their way to the Jewish LXX translators (the presumed source of the LXX of 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel),[25] but not to the collection of MT. Other texts circulating in ancient Israel made their way to the Qumran community. 4QReworked Pentateuch, reclassified as a biblical text,[26] may have been considered to be authoritative Scripture by the Qumran community or another group.

---

[24] As a result, it is unclear whether 2QExod[b] is a biblical manuscript or a fragment of a reworked Bible text (see M. Baillet in *DJD* III). For additional examples of such uncertainty, see chapter 10*.

[25] See chapter 20*.

[26] See chapter 20*.