



BRILL

DEAD SEA DISCOVERIES 24 (2017) 271–300

Dead Sea
Discoveries

brill.com/dsd

“The Temple which You Will Build for Me in the Land”

The Future Sanctuary in a Textual Tradition of Leviticus

Julia Rhyder

University of Lausanne

juliavictoria.rhyder@unil.ch

Abstract

This article examines the instruction regarding the wood offering and the festival of new oil in fragment 23 of 4QReworked Pentateuch C (4Q365), and in particular its setting at a future temple (בית) in the land. It argues that while 4Q365 23 represents a departure from earlier versions of Leviticus, it should be considered nonetheless as part of an authoritative version of this book. In introducing the new temple and its rituals, the addition develops notions already present within priestly ritual legislation concerned with the community's obligations towards the wilderness sanctuary. 4Q365 23 therefore has the potential to progress the present debate concerning the priestly traditions of the Pentateuch and cult centralization. In projecting the ritual obligations established at the wilderness shrine onto a future temple, the fragment throws new light on the way in which ritual legislation was used to promote a centralized cult in ancient Israel.

* This article forms part of a broader research project underway at the University of Lausanne with the support of the Swiss National Fund (project number 10001_5_153029) under the supervision of Christophe Nihan. Earlier versions of this paper were presented at two Graduate Student Symposiums held in Leuven, March 2015 and Berlin, June 2015 respectively. I wish to particularly thank George Brooke of the University of Manchester, who was kind enough to read an earlier version of this paper and provide many valuable comments. I also acknowledge the helpful remarks of the anonymous reviewers of *Dead Sea Discoveries*, in addition to the feedback of Joan Beaumont, Mark Brett, Hervé Gonzalez and Christophe Nihan on earlier drafts. All translations provided here are my own.

Keywords

4QReworked Pentateuch – 4Q365 – Leviticus – temple – centralization – variant literary editions – ritual

This article examines the addition at Lev 24:1–9 found in fragment 23 of 4QReworked Pentateuch C (4Q365), paying particular attention to the setting of the rituals described in this supplement at a future temple (בית) in the land.¹ It analyzes how the addition invokes the language and ideology of the priestly traditions of the Pentateuch to legitimate the ritual cult of a future temple, and considers what this reveals about the potential for ritual legislation to promote a centralized cult in ancient Israel.

4Q365 is a mid-first century BCE pentateuchal copy of a “harmonistic/expansionist”² text type that exhibits a tendency to rearrange, paraphrase and

1 4Q365 consists of thirty-eight numbered fragments that cover material from Gen 21:9 to Deut 20:1. Twenty-four additional fragments are thought to form part of the manuscript but are too small to be identified. Preserving material from all five books of the Torah, 4Q365 is the only known manuscript from the Judean desert in which the entire Pentateuch might potentially have been transmitted on a single scroll. It is not clear how to interpret this evidence, since the manuscript’s editors, based on Hartmut Stegemann’s unpublished report on 4Q364–67 (quoted in Emanuel Tov and Sidnie White, *DJD* 13:187–351, at 291), estimated that the length of 4Q365, if it did contain the entire Pentateuch, would be between 22 and 27 meters. This could make it significantly longer than any other scroll stored at Qumran, although Armin Lange argues that we should not rule out the possibility that many, if not “the majority”, of the scrolls found at the Dead Sea could have included “either all five or at least several books of the Pentateuch”; see Armin Lange, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Date of the Final Stage of the Pentateuch,” in *On Stone and Scroll: Essays in Honour of Graham Ivor Davies*, eds. James K. Aitken, Katharine J. Dell, and Brian A. Mastin, *BZAW* 420 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 287–304 (291). He points to 4QExod-Lev^f as a manuscript that may have originally included all five books of the Pentateuch, since at sixty lines it stands as one of the tallest scrolls housed at Qumran.

2 For this designation, see Sidnie White Crawford, “The Pentateuch as Found in the Pre-Samaritan Texts and 4QReworked Pentateuch,” in *Changes in Scripture. Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period*, eds. Hanne von Weissenberg, Juha Pakkala, and Marko Marttila, *BZAW* 419 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 123–36 (126); cf. George J. Brooke, “4Q158: Reworked Pentateuch^a or Reworked Pentateuch A?,” *DSD* 8 (2001): 219–41. This harmonistic/expansionist text type is, in some ways, in a continuum with the so-called pre-Samaritan pentateuchal texts found at Qumran. Pre-Samaritan manuscripts include 4QpaleoExod^m, 4QNum^b and 4QExod-Lev^f. They are characterized by a tendency to make additions of new or harmonizing material to the received text of the Pentateuch, while using

add to earlier versions of the Pentateuch. While 4Q365 was originally published as a “parabiblical” text, there is now widespread agreement that the manuscript was more likely intended to be received as a copy of the Pentateuch rather than as a reworked composition.³ Most decisive in this reclassification has been the observation by multiple scholars that the manuscript does not introduce a new narrative setting or speaker.⁴ Much of its extant material reproduces the known Pentateuch without major variation, and even when additional material is introduced, it is inserted in such a way as to be in keeping with the surrounding material.⁵

the same editorial principles as those of proto-MT manuscripts. However, the designation “pre-Samaritan” is not entirely helpful since a direct line between these manuscripts and the SP cannot be assumed (*pace* Eugene Ulrich, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Text,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, eds. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam [Leiden: Brill, 1998], 79–100 [88]).

- 3 See, e.g., Ulrich, “Dead Sea Scrolls,” 89; Michael Segal, “4QReworked Pentateuch or 4QPentateuch?” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery*, eds. Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society/Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000), 319–99; Brooke, “4Q158,” 222–27; Molly M. Zahn, *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts*, STDJ 103 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 98–121; Emanuel Tov, “From 4QReworked Pentateuch to 4QPentateuch(?),” in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*, ed. Mladen Popović, JSJSup 141 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010), 73–91 (esp. 79–81); reversing Tov and White, DJD 13:187–351. While affirming 4Q365 as a pentateuchal copy, I do not wish to assert a rigid distinction between copies of the Pentateuch, on the one hand, and rewritten compositions, on the other. Indeed, the evidence of the RP manuscripts should militate against such a distinction, since they evince features both of rewritten compositions such as *Jubilees* and the *Temple Scroll* (TS) and of versions of the Torah that do not display such harmonic/expansionist tendencies (see below). We should therefore avoid a neat separation between two classes of works and think instead of “a sliding scale,” as proposed by 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 (36).
- 4 It should be noted, however, that in Emanuel Tov’s case the decision to reconsider the status of the RP manuscripts was the result of his work on the LXX versions of 1 Kings (3 Kingdoms), Esther and Daniel (esp. Dan 4–6). He observed that the *Vorlagen* of these three LXX books were characterized by major rewriting of earlier versions, comparable to the kind of rewriting observed in the RP manuscripts. Tov therefore concluded that the RP manuscripts, like the *Vorlagen* of these LXX manuscripts, were most likely considered “regular Scripture text[s] that carried authority equal to that of the Hebrew texts underlying the LXX”; see Tov, “4QReworked Pentateuch,” 80.
- 5 As argued by Emanuel Tov, “The Textual Status of 4Q364–367 (4QRP),” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid*

Fragment 23 preserves a significant addition of new material, at the beginning of Lev 24:1–9, concerned with the bringing of offerings of wood and oil to the sanctuary. Much scholarly attention has been paid to the fragment's relationship with other Second Temple documents attesting these specific offerings. However, so far scholars have paid very little attention to the command that the offering of wood is to be used "for all the work of the temple (בית) which you will build for me in the land" (Is. 5–6; cf. l. 8). This distinctive statement—the only known textual tradition of Leviticus in which YHWH reveals to Moses instructions concerning the ritual cult of a future temple in the land—merits further examination because it breaks the otherwise complete silence of the priestly traditions on what the sanctuary of the post-wilderness period will be like. It therefore brings the book of Leviticus into much stronger alignment with traditions in the Hebrew scriptures that foreshadow a future cult in the land or mention a temple explicitly.

This paper explores two aspects of the addition that have so far received little attention. First, it analyzes the language of the addition and its placement within Leviticus to assess how the new materials concerning the future temple cult have been situated among the pentateuchal traditions. In this the paper builds upon the work of Molly Zahn, especially her attempt to identify the traditions that form the basis of the wording of the introduction to the addition in lines 4–5.⁶ However, it moves beyond her study by analyzing the language of

18–21 *March*, 1991, eds. Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner, STDJ 11 (Leiden/New York/Köln/Madrid: Brill, 1992), 43–82 (49–52). The rationale behind making such additions seems to have been exegetical: they alleviate potential contradictions or seeming omissions within the known Pentateuch. This can be observed, for example, in the first major addition of new material in the manuscript found at frg. 6a–c ii. Here the text of Exod 15 has been expanded to include what seems almost certainly to have been an extended song of Miriam in which the stub at Exod 15:21 has been given an additional seven lines of hymnal text. While this material is not found in any other textual tradition of Exodus, it seems to have been intended to resolve the question of why Miriam's song was limited to a single line while the Song of Moses was preserved in a much longer form. The person responsible for 4Q365 6 drew on the material of the Song of Moses, as well as other scriptural texts, to construct what he considered to be an appropriate song for Miriam. See further George J. Brooke, "Power to the Powerless: A Long-Lost Song of Miriam," *BAR* 20, (1994): 62–65.

6 See Zahn, *Rewritten Scripture*, 102–5. While other studies have discussed the temples described in the writings found at the Dead Sea (see esp. George J. Brooke, "The Ten Temples in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel. Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*, ed. John Day, LHBOTS 531 [London/New York: T&T Clark, 2005], 417–34), as far as I am aware, only Zahn has offered a detailed discussion of the temple mentioned in 4Q365 23.

the addition as a whole, not just its introduction, and by reassessing the significance of the placement of the addition within Lev 23–25.

Second, the paper explores the fragment’s implications for our understanding of the way in which ritual legislation could promote cult centralization in ancient Israel—a topic which has so far received limited attention in Hebrew Bible scholarship. In the fragment, the new temple is positioned as central to the cult not because of its location, which is never revealed, but because it is the site which unites all Israel in ritual service. This concept of ‘ritual centralization’ is not unique to the fragment but is foundational to the priestly account of Israel’s cultic origins at the wilderness sanctuary. The article will therefore conclude with a brief discussion of how 4Q365 23 might progress the present debate concerning the priestly traditions of the Pentateuch and cult centralization.

The Ritual Supplement in 4QReworked Pentateuch C Fragment 23⁷

וידבר יהוה אל מושה לאמור צו את בני ישראל לאמור בבואכמה אל הארץ אשר	4
[א]נֹכִי נֹתֵן לְכֶמָּה לְנַחֲלָה וּישְׁבַתֶם עֲלֶיהָ לְבִטַח תִּקְרִיבוּ עֲשִׂים לַעֲוֹלָה וּלְכוֹל מִלֶּאֱכָב[ת]	5
[הב]ית אשר תבנו לי בארץ לערוך אותם על מזבח העולה [ו]את העֶגְלָ[י]ם	6
] ׀ לְפִסְחִים וּלְשִׁלְמִים וּלְתֹדֹת וּלְנִדְבוֹת וּלְעֹלוֹת דְּבַר יוֹם]	7
] ל[׀ ל[׀] ׀ מִים וּלְד[ל]תוֹת וּלְכוֹל מִלֶּאֱכָת הַבַּיִת יִקְרִיבוּ]	8
] מ[׀עַד הַיֵּצֵהר יִקְרִיבוּ אֶת הָעֲצִים שְׁנַיִם]	9
] ׀ ׀ ׀ הַמִּקְרִיבִים בַּיּוֹם הַרִישׁ[ו] ׀ לֹוִי ׀]	10
] ׀ ראוּ בְזֶן וּשְׁמַעוּן] וּב[׀יּוֹם הַרְבֵּי יַעִי	11
] ל[12

- 4 YHWH spoke to Moses as follows: Command the Israelites as follows: When you come into the land that
- 5 I am giving to you for an inheritance, and you dwell upon it securely, you will bring wood for a burnt offering and for all the wor[k of
- 6 the tem]ple which you will build for me in the land, to arrange them upon the altar of burnt offering, [and] the calv[es
- 7]m for Passover sacrifices and for sacrifices of wellbeing and for thanks-giving offerings and for free-will offerings and for burnt offerings, daily [
- 8] and for the doors and for all the work of the temple the[y] will bri[ng]

7 The below transcription reproduces that found in Tov and White, DJD 13:290–91. The translation is my own, although it closely resembles that of the official edition, as well as that of Zahn, *Rewritten Scripture*, 102–3.

9] the [fe]stival of new oil. They will bring the wood, two [
 10] the ones who bring on the fir[st] day: Levi [
 11 Reu]ben and Simeon [and on t]he fou[th] day
 12]/[

Fragment 23 begins in lines 1–3 at the conclusion of the instructions for the celebration of Sukkot found at Lev 23:42–44. Line 4 commences with the command formula of Lev 24:1–2a α . However, where one would expect to find the legislation concerning the bringing of oil for the sanctuary candelabra, 4Q365 23 describes the bringing of wood to the temple by the twelve tribes in conjunction with מועד היצהר “the festival of new oil” (l. 9). Despite the fragmentary nature of the text, the wood seems to be intended both for burning sacrifices upon the altar and for sanctuary repairs (מלאכת הבית “the work of the temple” ls. 5–6), and to have been offered along with certain sacrifices (l. 7). While the first reference to the בית “temple” in line 6 is partly reconstructed, it is confirmed by the second mention of בית in line 8, where the word is preserved in full.

The Rituals of Fragment 23 and Other Second Temple Traditions

Scholars agree that 4Q365 23:4–12 is a secondary supplement to an earlier version of Leviticus in which the festal calendar concluded with the summary statement at Lev 23:44. The placement of the supplementary festivals of wood and new oil outside the festal calendar of Lev 23 strongly hints at their secondary nature. Moreover, the fact that the additional material is not attested in any other Leviticus manuscript supports treating it as a later intrusion. Yet even though the offerings of wood and new oil are not mentioned in the Pentateuch outside this fragment, there are strong indications that they had an established place in the festal calendar of the Second Temple period.⁸ In particular, scholars have long noted the close parallels between 4Q365 23 and the description of the festivals of new oil and wood offering in the *Temple Scroll* (*TS*). Both documents seem to command that the offerings of new oil and wood be brought to the temple during a joint festal celebration. In *TS* the two offerings are paired as taking place before the festivals of the seventh month (see 11Q19 23), with the festival of new oil forming part of the firstfruits

8 An offering of wood is attested in Josephus (*War* 2.425) as well as early rabbinic sources and other Second Temple documents (e.g., *Aramaic Levi Document* 31; 11QTemple^a [= 11Q19] 23; 43:3–4; very likely 11QTemple^b [= 11Q20] 6:11–18, on this see further below). For the festival of new oil see 4QCalendrical Document E^b 5 and 11Q19 21–22.

festivals.⁹ The festival of new oil was to take place fifty days after the festival of the firstfruits of wine (11Q19 21–22). Furthermore, it would seem from what is fragmentarily preserved in 11Q19 24 and 4Q365 23 that the tribes were to appear in the same order in both documents. This precise order of the tribes, in which Reuben and Simeon appear in fifth and sixth position respectively, is attested nowhere else apart from 11Q19 24 and 4Q365 23; even within *TS*, no tribe list matches precisely that which is found at 11Q19 24.¹⁰

These correspondences make it quite probable that there is a literary relationship between *TS* and 4Q365. While 4Q365 is a mid-first century BCE manuscript, it could point to a much earlier Torah tradition that was known to the author of *TS* and considered authoritative, such that it would be used as a source for this Rewritten Scripture composition.¹¹ Given that scholars generally agree that *TS* was most likely written sometime during the middle of the second century BCE, this means that, if 4Q365 preserves traces of a source text for *TS*, a version of the Torah that already included the additional festivals

9 Immediately after the description of the festival of new oil at 11Q19 23 we find a description of a festival during which the twelve tribes are to bring their offerings on set days over a six-day period and, importantly, in the same order as that which seems to be prescribed in 4Q365 23:10–11. While the six-day festival is not said to be the festival of wood offering in the extant material of 11Q19, another fragment currently classified as belonging to a different *TS* manuscript (11Q20) provides a brief list specifying which tribes were to present an offering on which day, and which explicitly mentions wood (11Q20 6:11–18). Zahn suggests that this small fragment could fit into the lacuna at the top of 11Q19 23, in which case the complete section would have introduced the wood offering and discussed the bringing of wood day-by-day to the temple by the tribes; see Zahn, *Rewritten Scripture*, 105–6; cf. Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, revised and English ed., 3 vols. (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983), 1:222–24. However, neither 4Q365 23 nor *TS* presents a direct quotation of the other, since it is clear that the description of the festival of new oil in 11Q20 6:11–18 could not have fit at the point where the festival is mentioned at 4Q365 23:9, and the complete material introducing the wood offering in 4Q365 23:4–8 could not fit at the top of 11Q20 6, either.

10 See further Molly M. Zahn, “4QReworked Pentateuch C and the Literary Sources of the ‘Temple Scroll’: A New (Old) Proposal,” *DSD* 19 (2012): 133–58 (150).

11 As argued by Strugnell, quoted in Ben-Zion Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness* (Cincinnati, OH: Hebrew Union College, 1983), 205–6; Brooke, “Rewritten Law,” 33; Lange, “Dead Sea Scrolls,” 296; Zahn, “Literary Sources.” On why the reverse direction of dependence—that it was 4Q365 which knew and reworked *TS*—is unlikely, see Zahn, “Literary Sources,” 152.

in fragment 23 was in circulation by the early second or perhaps even late third century BCE.¹²

Further evidence that might hint at the antiquity of a Torah tradition that mentioned at least the wood offering is found in Ezra-Nehemiah. Nehemiah 13:31 briefly references a קרבן העצים “wood offering” as having been provided, along with the firstfruits, “at appointed times.” Furthermore, Neh 10:35 lists this same קרבן העצים as part of a broader description of the offerings and gifts brought by the community to the Jerusalem temple. However, this text moves beyond the mention of the wood offering in Neh 13:31, since here this offering is said to have been performed בתורה ככתוב “as it is written in the law.”

This reference in Neh 10:35 to a law of the wood offering has been the subject of considerable debate. What light might it shed, if any, on the legal instruction found in 4Q365 23? Most commentators advocate a direct literary connection between Neh 10:35 and 4Q365 23, although they disagree on which text has chronological priority. However, there are a number of reasons to assume that neither Neh 10:35 nor 4Q365 23 is directly dependent on the other. Firstly, it is unlikely that Neh 10:35 is directly referencing the textual tradition of 4Q365.¹³ There are significant differences in how the wood offering is presented in Neh 10:35 to how it is prescribed in 4Q365 23. Different communal representatives are responsible for bringing the wood: while 4Q365 23 attributes this role to the tribes, Neh 10:35 assigns it to families following a decision discerned by lots. Nehemiah 10:35 also seems unaware of the association in 4Q365 of the wood offering with the festival of new oil and (the implication) that it is to occur at a fixed time each year.

In turn, it is doubtful if 4Q365 23 betrays the influence of Neh 10:35.¹⁴ This interpretation, which has much support from scholars, rests on the assumption that the בתורה ככתוב formula in Neh 10:35 is a pseudonymous attribution

12 On the dating of *TS*, see Florentino García Martínez, “Temple Scroll,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 927–33 (931–32); Casey Deryl Elledge, *The Statutes of the King: The Temple Scroll’s Legislation on Kingship* (11Q19 LVI12–LIX21), CahRB 56 (Paris: Gabalda, 2004), 37–45; Simone Paganini, ‘Nicht darfst du zu diesen Wörtern etwas hinzufügen’: Die Rezeption des Deuteronomiums in der Tempelrolle: Sprache, Autoren und Hermeneutik, BZABR 11 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verl., 2009), 265–71.

13 Pace Lange, “Dead Sea Scrolls,” 300–302.

14 Pace Zahn, *Rewritten Scripture*, 107; Cana Werman, “The Wood-Offering: The Convolutional Evolution of a Halakhah in Qumran and Rabbinic Law,” in *New Perspectives on Old Texts. Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 9–11 January, 2005*, eds. Esther G. Chazon and Betsy Halpern-Amaru, STDJ 88 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010), 151–81 (157–58); cf. Sidnie

of ritual innovation to Mosaic Torah as opposed to a literal citation of an extant law.¹⁵ This would have served to validate the ritualized offering of wood by associating it with the law of Moses, even though a corresponding law was not included in the Torah itself. A later scribe, so the argument goes, would have read Neh 10:35 and, considering such an offering to be indeed fitting among the Mosaic Law, inserted it within his copy of the Pentateuch. Sidnie White Crawford and Christopher Hoffmann even claim that the wording of 4Q365 deliberately echoes that of Neh 10:33–35, suggesting that “the scribe who inserted the expansion on frg. 23 probably had *Neh* 10:35 in mind.”¹⁶

There are a number of indications, however, that this is a misreading of the evidence. The literary parallels identified by White Crawford and Hoffmann are limited and insufficient to demonstrate that the language used to describe the festival in 4Q365 was directly dependent on Neh 10:35. In particular, 4Q365 23 does not make use of the key term קרבן העצים used in Neh 10:35 to describe the wood offering. Instead it uses the general term קרבן in referencing the offering, a choice that is difficult to reconcile with the theory that the author of 4Q365 23 modeled the addition directly on Neh 10:35.¹⁷ Moreover, in the absence of any direct mirroring of wording, there seems little reason to argue that the addition at 4Q365 23 was inspired by Neh 10:35. The authority of Ezra-Nehemiah in the Second Temple period should not be overestimated; there is no evidence that scribes sought to amend the Pentateuch on other occasions in which the citations of law in Ezra-Nehemiah diverged from what the Torah actually said (e.g., the priestly courses in Ezra 6:18); and it is difficult to see why the case of the wood offering would have required a more interventionist approach. Finally, there are reasons to question whether the ככתוב בתורה formula in Neh 10:35 is best understood as a case of pseudonymous attribution of ritual innovation to Mosaic Torah in this case. It is noteworthy that all of the other offerings mentioned in the surrounding context in Neh 10 contain corresponding instructions within the Mosaic Torah. It therefore seems probable

White Crawford and Christopher A. Hoffmann, “A Note on 4Q365, Frg. 23 and Nehemiah 10:33–36,” *RevQ* 23 (2008): 429–30.

- 15 For this argument, see e.g., David J. A. Clines, “Nehemiah 10 as an Example of Early Jewish Biblical Exegesis,” *JOT* 21 (1981): 111–17; cf. 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, LSTS 33 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 202–16; Juha Pakkala, “Quotations and References of the Pentateuchal Laws in Ezra-Nehemiah,” in *Changes in Scripture*, 193–221 (esp. 213).
- 16 White Crawford and Hoffmann, “Note on 4Q365,” 430.
- 17 Attempts to explain why קרבן העצים might have been omitted in 4Q365 23 (e.g., Werman, “Wood Offering,” 157–58) only introduce unnecessary complexity.

that the phrase ככתוב בתורה in Neh 10:35 also betrays knowledge of an actual prescription for the wood offering by the author of this verse.

The debate about which of these texts is dependent on the other could be resolved if we view them as constituting independent witnesses to a version of the Pentateuch in which a law of the wood offering was already included.¹⁸ Self-evidently, such a hypothesis is prefaced on the assumption that such a text was already in circulation by the time both 4Q365 and Neh 10:35 were written. Determining a probable timeframe is complicated by the likelihood that Neh 10:35 constitutes a late addition to Neh 10.¹⁹ Nevertheless, one can imagine that such a version of the Pentateuch would need to have already been in circulation at least by the middle of the third century BCE (if not the century before), if it was to be known to the person responsible for Neh 10:35. Though speculative, this reconstruction adds some additional support to the idea that 4Q365 23 preserves traces of a textual tradition of an expansionist version of Leviticus more ancient than this specific manuscript housed at Qumran.

The Temple in Fragment 23 and the 4QTemple? Fragments

A particularly interesting feature of 4Q365 23 is that it both legislates the offering of wood and new oil and also explains how these rituals relate to a future temple to be built in the land. In lines 5–6 the wood offering is described as fulfilling a dual function: serving to restock the altar and contributing to “the work of the temple.” The temple, then, is not incidental; it provides the necessary setting and supplies the purpose for these new ritual processes. It is this nexus between festal legislation and the imagined future temple which gives the fragment its distinctive quality and significance.²⁰

Before analyzing this nexus, we need to consider possible additional references to the temple mentioned in the 4Q365 manuscript beyond fragment 23 itself. In particular, we should acknowledge five additional fragments currently labeled 4QTemple? (= 4Q365a). These fragments are written on the same leather and exhibit the same handwriting and orthography as the 4Q365 fragments. The original editor of 4Q365a and 4Q365 also observed that

18 Christophe Nihan came to similar conclusion in an unpublished seminar paper delivered at Yale University in November 2014.

19 On the relative lateness of Neh 10:35, see Titus Reinmuth, “Reform und Tora bei Nehemia. Neh 10,31–40 und die Autorisierung der Tora in der Perserzeit,” *ZAR* 7 (2001): 287–317 (315).

20 This change to a temple setting in 4Q365 23 does not reflect a total shift of sanctuary context in the 4Q365 ms. The אהל מועד is attested on at least three occasions in the preserved fragments (see 4Q365 26a–b 4; 31a–c 5, 16). This supports reading the reference to the בית in fragment 23 as an intentional device in this ritual supplement.

a diagonal crease is visible on 4Q365a 2 that is also present on 4Q365 12b iii and 23.²¹ This pleads in favor of including the 4Q365a fragments with the rest of the 4Q365 materials. However, the 4Q365a fragments were not published as part of 4Q365 because they do not include any materials paralleling the known Pentateuch.²² Moreover, White Crawford has recently suggested that it may be impossible to locate fragments 2, 3, and 5 of 4Q365a within the column structure of 4Q365, which would provide material support for the decision to publish them separately.²³ However, the separation of 4Q365a from 4Q365 has been widely questioned in the recent scholarly discussion.²⁴ The fragmentary state of 4Q365a makes it difficult to gain a sufficiently clear picture of its column structure so as to rule out that its materials were once integrated within 4Q365.²⁵ By contrast, the strength of the material evidence that supports their unification strongly favors reading them as forming part of a single Torah composition, irrespective of the 'unorthodox' content of 4Q365a.²⁶

21 See Stegemann 1994, quoted in Tov and White, DJD 13:291; cf. Armin Lange, *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer, Band 1: Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 40.

22 See Tov and White, DJD 13:319–34.

23 Sidnie White Crawford, "4QTemple? (4Q385a) Revisited," in *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the Occasion of Her 65th Birthday*, eds. Jeremy Penner, Ken M. Penner, and Cecilia Wassen, STDJ 98 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2012), 87–95 (91–94).

24 See, e.g., 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: A Symposium in Honour of Adam S. Van Der Woude on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*, eds. Florentino García Martínez and Ed Noort, VTSup 73 (Leiden: Brill, 1998); Daniel K. Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures among the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: T&T Clark, 2007), 108–9; Zahn, *Rewritten Scripture*, 98; idem, "Literary Sources"; Lange, *Handbuch*, 39–40.

25 As argued by Zahn, "Literary Sources," 139–46.

26 Admittedly, it is unclear how such a lengthy addition of building instructions relating to a future temple might have fit within the pentateuchal narrative; see White Crawford "4QTemple? (4Q385a) Revisited," 93. However, 4Q365 is simply too fragmentary to rule out the possibility that these building instructions for a future temple might have been successfully integrated as an addition of new material at some point in the pentateuchal narrative. Furthermore, as asserted by Zahn in her recent treatment of this issue, the evidence of the multifarious transmission of scripture in the Second Temple period should prevent us from automatically assuming that an edition of the Pentateuch that included these building instructions would have been disqualified from being considered authoritative Torah; see Zahn "Literary Sources," 140. Indeed, the evidence suggesting that *TS* drew upon both the 4Q365a materials and 4Q365 23 supports this conclusion. The arguments in favor of separating 4Q365a from 4Q365 therefore seem to be guided by the same

The 4Q365a materials are relevant to the present discussion because four of the five fragments contain specifications for the building of a sanctuary structure referred to as a *בית*. Fragments 2–5 preserve part of several columns of text that detail the building instructions for a temple, including the measurements of gates that were to be named after the tribes (frg. 2 col. ii), as well as other buildings and objects. Significantly, 4Q365a 3:1 even refers to “the temple which you will build (...)” (*הבית אשר תבנה*), a phrase that mirrors 4Q365 23:5 (cf. the reference to *דלתות* “doors” in 4Q365a 4:1, which also occurs in 4Q365 23:8). Though fragment 1 does not contain building instructions, it does describe the celebration of the festival of Unleavened Bread. It might be suggested, then, that 4Q365a preserves a lengthy addition of new material to the Pentateuch that included both the command to build the temple and also the instructions for certain rituals that were to be observed there. The setting in 4Q365 23 of the offerings of wood and oil at a temple would then not be an isolated occurrence.

However, any potential relationship between the temple described in 4Q365a and that of 4Q365 23 remains difficult to determine, owing to the fragmentary character of these passages. Since it is impossible to locate the 4Q365a materials at specific points within the pentateuchal narrative, we cannot assess how they related to the offering supplement at Lev 24:1–9 preserved in 4Q365 23.²⁷ We therefore stand on firmer ground if we analyze the temple of 4Q365 23 largely independent of the further fragments of 4Q365a. That said, 4Q365a remains possible evidence that the concern for the building of a temple in the land was a key feature of the distinctive edition of the Pentateuch of which the ritual supplement of 4Q365 23 was a part. This adds some additional support to reading the reference to a future temple in 4Q365 23 as an intentional, and even major, component of the supplement.

entrenched expectations about what *should* be included in a pentateuchal manuscript that originally led to the classification of the Reworked Pentateuch manuscripts as parabiblical literature, rather than by the evidence of how scripture was most likely transmitted in antiquity.

27 It can be briefly noted, however, that the voicing of the 4Q365a fragments suggests that the description of the building account might have been located somewhere within YHWH’s commandments given to Moses, and therefore in Exodus–Numbers. See further Zahn, “Literary Sources,” 144.

4QReworked Pentateuch C Fragment 23 and Its Intertexts

The scholarly attention paid to the relationship between 4Q365 23 and *TS*, on the one hand, and Neh 10:35, on the other, has been considerable; as has the interest surrounding the relationship between 4Q365 and 4Q365a. However, this has been largely at the expense of a detailed analysis of the intertextual relationships between 4Q365 23 and other scriptural traditions. Yet it is the allusions to pentateuchal texts and other scriptures in the wording of the fragment, as well as its placement within Leviticus, that arguably sheds the most light on how the new temple and its distinctive festivals were intended to supplement the ritual materials of the Torah.

Echoes of Priestly Ritual Legislation

While adding new material, the ritual supplement in fragment 23 is textually well integrated within Lev 23–25. It begins in line 4 with the same speech command formula that would otherwise have been found at Lev 24:1–2a α , retaining the rare instruction to Moses to command (צוה *piel*) the Israelites (v. 2a α). Lines 4–5 then introduce the new instructions for the festivals of wood offering and new oil with a description of the entry into the land: בבואכמה אל הארץ “when you come into the land that I am giving to you for an inheritance, and you dwell upon it securely (...).” The phraseology of this introduction echoes other introductory formulas found in Lev 23–25. It is reminiscent of the introduction to the firstfruits laws in Lev 23:10a β , which reads, כי-תבאו אל-הארץ אשר אני נתן לכם “when you come to the land that I am giving to you (...).” It also looks forward to the introduction to the law of the sabbath for the land in Lev 25:2b α , where the entry into the land is described using similar language (כי תבאו אל-הארץ אשר אני נתן לכם). Further links with Lev 25 may be observed in the reference to “dwelling securely” (לבתח + ישב) in 4Q365 23:5, which echoes the same expression used in 25:18b and 19b.²⁸

28 As observed by David M. 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: Chr. Kaiser—Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2001), 117.

With such strong textual links the addition stands as a fitting supplement to Lev 23–25’s overarching topic of sacred times.²⁹ Commentators agree that the fragment’s instructions for the wood offering and the festival of new oil were most likely intended to form an appendix to the festal calendar of Lev 23, so that the new celebrations would appear fitting among the מועדי יהוה “fixed times of YHWH” revealed at Sinai.³⁰ The link with Lev 23:10 in lines 4–5 is particularly pertinent, since it asserts that there is a continuity between the festival of new oil and of wood and the earlier laws dealing with firstfruits in 23:9–22. Recall that the festival of new oil is listed in *TS* as a firstfruits festival to take place after the festival of new wine (see 11Q19 21–22); and while the offering of wood would probably not have constituted a firstfruit strictly speaking, its association with the festival of new oil suggests that both offerings were to be brought to the sanctuary in conjunction with firstfruits. This is supported by the evidence of Neh 13:39, which mentions the offering of wood (though not the new oil) in association with the provision of firstfruits. Hence by introducing the festivals of new oil and wood offering with similar wording to Lev 23:10, the person responsible for the addition positions these celebrations as legitimate extensions of the earlier firstfruit instructions, and thus as a fitting addition to the festal calendar.

Beyond this, it appears that the person responsible for the addition, in an effort to reinforce his case, has also borrowed from the wording of the firstfruits regulations in Deut 26. In Deut 26:1 the offering of firstfruits is introduced in the following way: והיה כִּי־תבוא אֶל־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ נָתַן לְךָ נַחֲלָה וּרְשָׁתָהּ “when you have come into the land that YHWH your God is giving you as an inheritance, and you possess it and you dwell in it (...).” The influence of this verse on the addition is clear, especially in the use of the term נחלה “inheritance” in 4Q365 23:5.³¹ This term is never found in Leviticus but is a favorite descriptor of the land in Deuteronomy.³² It is significant, however, that

29 For the idea that chs. 23–25 are united by this topic, see Volker Wagner, “Zur Existenz des sogenannten ‘Heiligkeitsetzes,’” *ZAW* 86 (1974): 307–16 (314–15); Christophe Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch: A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus*, FAT II 25 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 98–99.

30 It is interesting to note that the reference to the מועד היצהר is introduced in fragment 23 without an accompanying command for how the festival is to be observed. Since this festival is unknown in other witnesses to the Pentateuch, this strongly suggests that 4Q365 originally included another addition to the earlier Pentateuch in which the instructions for this festival were given in full. Unfortunately, no trace of such an instruction has been preserved among the extant fragments.

31 As observed by Carr, “Method,” 117; Zahn, *Rewritten Scripture*, 103.

32 See, e.g., Deut 4:21, 38; 15:4; 19:10, 14; 21:23; 24:4; 25:19; 26:1.

the addition does not merely reproduce Deut 26:1 but instead infuses it with the phraseology of Leviticus. Note, for example, the use of the independent personal pronoun **אֲנִי** in line 5 in referring to YHWH, which has no parallel in Deut 26:1 but is in keeping with YHWH’s hortatory style of address that is characteristic not only of Lev 23:10 // 25:2 but of the divine speech of Lev 17–26 as a whole. Thus the person responsible for the fragment, by intermingling the wording of Deuteronomy and Leviticus, provides multiple pentateuchal precedents for the new rituals, while bringing the firstfruit laws of Lev 23 and Deut 26 into greater alignment.

However, the strong textual and topical links between Lev 23 and the addition are somewhat complicated by the latter’s placement. Rather than its being inserted directly within the festal calendar of Lev 23, the addition has been inserted after the introduction to the following chapter at Lev 24:1–2aα.³³ How do we explain this? Zahn notes this “intriguing aspect to the placement of this addition,”³⁴ but throws little light on the question. Jacob Milgrom, however, suggests that the explanation may be found in the common focus of the addition and Lev 24:2aβ–9—the original continuation of Lev 24:1–2aα—on communal offerings that are made to the sanctuary.³⁵ Indeed, despite its fragmentary

33 As Milgrom observes (*Leviticus 23–27*, AB 3C [New York: Doubleday, 2001], 2073; cf. idem, “Qumran’s Biblical Hermeneutics: The Case of the Wood Offering,” *RevQ* 16 (1994): 449–56 [454]), the festivals outlined in 4Q365 23 would be “chronologically out of place” in their current position if 4Q365 presumed the same date of the festival as that which is given in *TS*; the festival of new oil is scheduled to take place in *TS* before the festivals of the seventh month, which would support the idea that a position before Lev 23:23 for the supplementary material would have been more fitting than their current location after the legislation for Sukkot. However, in the calendar of *TS* the festival of new oil is a pentecost festival: it is celebrated after an interval of seven full weeks, with the year being broken into seven such periods followed by a supplementary period of fourteen days (i.e., a 364 day calendar). See further Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 1:116–31; Johann Maier, *The Temple Scroll: An Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 70–86. Since this conception of the year is not found in Lev 23, the person responsible for the addition may have felt unable to insert the offering supplement directly into the festal calendar (Brooke, personal communication). Nevertheless, such an explanation cannot fully account for the location of the addition at Lev 24:1–9, since it remains unclear why the person responsible for the supplement would have retained the introductory formula of Lev 24:1–2aα if the intention was merely to introduce two new offerings to the festal year.

34 Zahn, *Rewritten Scripture*, 108.

35 Milgrom, “Qumran’s Biblical Hermeneutics,” 454. The fragmentary nature of 4Q365 makes it difficult to know whether the earlier material of Lev 24:2aβ–9 was replaced by the offerings of wood and oil, or whether it was retained at a later point, and if so, how it was rearranged. I am inclined to suppose that the offerings described in Lev 24:2aβ–9 were

description, the purpose of the wood offering is clear: it supplies the materials required for the sanctuary's upkeep (specifically for the *מלאכת הבית* "the work of the temple" [ls. 5–6, 8] and re-stocking the altar [l. 6]). A similar focus on the service of the sanctuary is evident in Lev 24:2a β –4. These verses instruct the Israelites to bring an offering of *שמן זית זך כהית* "pure beaten olive oil" to the *אהל מועד* "tent of meeting," so that Aaron might keep the sanctuary candelabra continually burning.³⁶ The fragment admittedly differs from Lev 24:2a β –4 in that it includes wood in its offering. But its combination of wood with oil still provides an intriguing echo with the focus of the original materials in Lev 24:2a β –4 on the Israelites' duty to bring oil to the sanctuary.³⁷ Furthermore, there are phraseological connections between the two texts, with the same verb being used, in Lev 24:3, to describe Aaron's action of arranging (*ערך*) the candelabra before the sanctuary curtain and, in 4Q365 23:6, the arranging (*ערך*) of the wood offering upon the altar.³⁸ It therefore appears that the person responsible for the addition perceived a common focus between the new rituals and the earlier materials of Lev 24:2a β –4: both texts deal with the Israelites' duty to service the sanctuary with communal donations, especially those of oil.

These links to Lev 24:2a β –4, arising from both the placement of the addition as well as its wording, suggest that the ritual supplement does more than merely append two new festivals to the Israelite calendar. The fragment foreshadows that the same kind of ritual obligations, begun at Sinai, will apply at the future temple structure in the land. By instructing similar communal offerings, in service to the *בית*, as those which were originally found in Lev 24:1–9, in service to the *אהל מועד*, the fragment construes the Israelites' obligations towards the future temple as being of an essentially similar nature to those which were established at the wilderness sanctuary.

not removed entirely but rather displaced and taken up again at a later point. However, the topical connection between the new material and Lev 24:1–9 could mean that these new festivals constitute a rewriting of the earlier offerings, and were therefore intended to replace them.

36 While the term for oil is different in the two contexts, the choice of the term *יצהר* in 4Q365 23:9 almost certainly reflects the fact that this is a firstfruits festival and so requires the bringing of *new* oil.

37 As noted by Zahn, *Rewritten Scripture*, 108.

38 The wording of the wood offering also evokes previous ritual texts mentioning the wood of the altar in the context of the *עלה* "burnt offering." See esp. Lev 1:7 and 6:5 [Eng. 6:12] where the priests are said to arrange (*ערך*) the wood upon the altar for the offering of the *עלה*.

This sense of continuity between the service of the two sanctuaries is facilitated by other allusions within the fragment to priestly texts outside Leviticus that describe the assembly and dedication of the wilderness sanctuary. In particular, the specification that the wood be used לכול מלאכת הבית “for all the work of the temple” recalls the language used in Exod 35–40 when recounting the construction of the wilderness sanctuary using the offerings of the Israelite community. Not only does the term מלאכה occur over twenty times in Exod 35–40 but the communal offerings are said to have been given with the *purpose* of contributing to the works of the sanctuary. Exodus 36:3 (MT) notably reports that the sanctuary builders “received from Moses the free-will offering that the sons of Israel had brought for doing the work of the sanctuary (למלאכת עבדת הקדש).” A comparable formulation is found at Exod 38:24 (MT). Bearing even stronger resemblance to 4Q365 23:5–6, this verse recounts the offerings of gold to be used בכל מלאכת הקדש “in all the work of the sanctuary.” The similarity of the language used to describe the wood offering in 4Q365 23 suggests that the maintenance of the future temple was positioned as analogous to the assembly of the wilderness shrine, thus implying a close conceptual connection between the two sanctuaries.

There is also a clear echo of Num 7—the account of the re-dedication of the wilderness shrine—in the fragment’s depiction of tribal leaders bringing wood to the temple.³⁹ Numbers 7 describes how the tribes bring offerings to the wilderness shrine over a twelve-day ceremony in which each of the tribes is allocated a specific day to come to the sanctuary. The ceremony culminates in the dedication of the altar and the symbolic representation of the tribes in the “twelve silver plates, twelve silver basins, twelve golden dishes” (v. 84). These are to be housed within the sanctuary as it accompanies them on their march through the wilderness. It is difficult to determine the extent to which Num 7 influenced the depiction of the wood offering in 4Q365 23, given that the fragment breaks off at this point in the text. Still, the texts are strikingly similar in their notion of a festival—whether ongoing in the case of 4Q365, or a one-off in the case of Num 7—in which tribal leaders, symbolically representing the whole community, bring offerings to the sanctuary *over a period of set days*. Admittedly, Num 7 describes a twelve-day festival while 4Q365 23 stipulates that the tribes are to present two-by-two over a six-day period. The person responsible for 4Q365 23 may have been working according to an inherited conception of how the wood offering fits within the festal calendar, such that there are limited days available for the presentation of wood at the sanctuary in conjunction with the festival of new oil. Possibly it represented a subtle

39 As noted by Werman, “Wood Offering,” 157.

correction of Num 7, since a twelve-day festival would require that one tribe bring offerings to the sanctuary on the sabbath.⁴⁰ Nevertheless, in both texts the motif of set days being assigned to the tribes is core to the depiction of the bringing of communal offerings to the sanctuary.

What is more, the concept in 4Q365 23 of the tribes' representation at the sanctuary may betray the influence of Lev 24:5–9 in addition to Num 7, thereby constituting a further point of continuity between the addition and its immediate context in Leviticus. In earlier versions of the Leviticus, YHWH commands, in Lev 24:5–9, that the bringing of oil is to be followed by the preparation and display of twelve loaves in two rows of six on the golden table inside the sanctuary. Scholars have long suspected that the twelve loaves of bread represent the twelve tribes of Israel.⁴¹ While this is not explicitly stated in Lev 24:5–9, such a reading would explain why the laying out (again, ערך) of the loaves each sabbath is associated with the establishment of an עולם “eternal covenant” (v. 8) between YHWH and the בני ישראל “sons of Israel”: the bread itself will be a continual reminder of the community before the deity. Moreover, in v. 7 the loaves are said to be offered on behalf of the Israelites not only as part of their permanent obligation (ברית) towards the deity, but also as a means for the deity to remember them: “you shall put pure frankincense upon the rows; it shall be for the bread as a memorial (אזכרה) food offering for YHWH.” The root זכר elsewhere in the priestly traditions has strong covenantal connotations, with YHWH being said to have “remembered” his covenantal obligations (Gen 9:15–16; Exod 2:24; 6:5; 36:42, 45; cf. Jer 14:21; Ezek 16:60; Amos 1:9; Ps 106:46). This supports the idea that the display bread served as a visible

40 This was suggested to me by Christophe Nihan (personal communication).

41 See e.g., August Dillmann, *Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus* (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1897), 653; Roland de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*, trans. John McHugh, 2:422 (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1973), 422; Andreas Ruwe, *‘Heiligkeitsgesetz’ und ‘Priesterschrift’: Literaturgeschichtliche und rechtssystematische Untersuchungen zu Leviticus 17:1–26:2*, FAT I 26 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 326; Milgrom, *Leviticus 23–27*, 2095; Alfred Marx, *Lévitique 17–27*, Commentaire de l’Ancient Testament 3b (Geneva: Labor et Fides, 2011), 163 with n. 17; Thomas Hieke, *Leviticus, Zweiter Teilband: 16–27, übersetzt und ausgelegt*, Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament 38 (Freiburg/Basel/Vienna: Herder, 2014), 871, 947. The use of twelve objects to represent the tribes is observed in a number of other passages in the HB, e.g., Exod 24:4; 28:9–12, 21; Josh 4:1–7; 1 Kgs 18:31. What is more, the particular verb ערך and others associated with the arrangement of the bread in Lev 24:5–9 (e.g., שים “place” [v. 6], נתן “put” [v. 7]) appear elsewhere in the HB with ברית (see, e.g., 2 Sam 23:5). This suggests that there was a close connection between the laying out of the bread and the action by which the deity was reminded of its covenantal obligations towards the Israelites.

reminder within the sanctuary of YHWH’s covenantal partner—the twelve tribes of Israel—so as to ensure it remains favorably displayed towards them.

The emphasis on the tribes in the ritual supplement of 4Q365 23 is thus a further indication that the fragment develops notions already present within the priestly traditions concerning the Israelite community’s ritual interactions with the deity at the sanctuary. It depicts the future temple as maintaining the same socio-cultic function as that of the wilderness sanctuary of presenting the twelve tribes before the deity. But it now makes this communal representation dependent on the tribes’ willingness to share the responsibility of bringing donations to the central sanctuary. While Lev 24:5–9 emphasizes Aaron’s role of arranging the loaves before the deity as a memorial food offering, 4Q365 23 follows Num 7 in stressing the tribes’ responsibility to ensure that they are represented before YHWH at the central shrine: they must convene at the temple on their allocated days to present gifts to the deity, just as they had done during the dedication of the wilderness shrine.

These links to priestly texts in the wording of the addition in 4Q365 23 suggest that the new materials are intended, first and foremost, to extend and develop the claims these traditions make about the kind of *cult and community* that the deity requires of its ritual servants. The new festivals complement the focus of Lev 23–25 on the need for the Israelites to observe YHWH’s sacred times by adding two occasions on which the Israelites must synchronize their worship of YHWH and bring festal donations as a unified collective on set days. The fragment also builds on Lev 24:1–9, Exod 35–40 and Num 7 to establish the future temple as standing in a continuum with the central shrine established during the time at Sinai. On the one hand, both the tent of meeting and the future temple are the shared responsibility of the entire community. On the other, they are both chosen sites at which the Israelites must present themselves before their patron deity as a unified and centralized community via their communal donations.

Extending the Priestly Traditions

The above analysis stresses the continuity between 4Q365 23 and the priestly texts that describe the ritual practice of the wilderness shrine. Yet, for all these links, the decision in 4Q365 23 to directly refer to a future sanctuary in Leviticus signals a major break from earlier versions of this book, and of the priestly traditions as a whole. There is no hint in the priestly traditions that YHWH intended Moses to receive the instructions for building a more permanent temple structure in the land. How, then, does the person responsible for the fragment justify the reference to a future temple within the Leviticus legislation?

One strategy 4Q365 23 seems to have adopted was to borrow from texts outside the priestly traditions that mention a temple or future cult. Such intertextual links construe the future temple as having always been YHWH's intention for the Israelites once they had come into the land, even though such a temple is never mentioned in earlier versions of Leviticus. First, the allusion mentioned above to Deut 26:1 in the introduction to the addition could hint at the central מקום "place" promoted by Deuteronomy. As Zahn comments, "[t]his verse makes good sense as a source for the introduction to a command to bring wood to the sanctuary, since Deut 26:1–11 likewise commands the Israelites to bring the produce of the land (here firstfruits instead of wood) to 'the place (המקום) that YHWH your God will choose.'⁴² This allusion to Deut 26 may thus serve to ensure that the future temple, to which the offerings of wood and new oil are to be brought, is seen as commensurate with the מקום that was chosen by YHWH. In support of this idea, Zahn notes a further possible echo in the fragment of Deut 12:10. Here the Israelites are commanded to bring their sacrifices to the chosen מקום only when YHWH has given them rest from their enemies and they "dwell securely" (יֵשֶׁב + בַּטָּח) in the land. The recurrence of this combination of the verb יֵשֶׁב and the term בַּטָּח in 4Q365 23:5 may therefore, in Zahn's view, constitute an allusion to the conditions outlined in Deut 12 for the beginning of the centralized sacrificial cult at YHWH's chosen place.⁴³ Arguably, Zahn's interpretation is weakened by the fact that the same language (יֵשֶׁב + בַּטָּח) occurs in the immediate context of the addition at Lev 25:18b, 19b. Moreover, as argued above, the wording of lines 4–5 is also a blend of Deut 26:1 and Lev 23:10 // 25:2, as opposed to a rewriting of the former verse alone. However, it remains plausible that the decision to highlight these specific conditions for the beginning of the future cult was influenced in part by their having been mentioned in Deuteronomy in the context of describing the cult of the future מקום in the land. The rituals revealed to Moses at Sinai were thus subtly construed as eventually being performed in a temple that was itself to be established at the "place that YHWH will choose." Yet it is noteworthy that the addition does not make use of the key D phrase יהוה אלהיך יבחר המקום אשר יבחר יהוה אלהיך or its variants when introducing the future sanctuary, but instead uses the term בית—a term which does not occur with the meaning 'temple' in either Leviticus or Deuteronomy.

By specifically using this term (בית), the fragment arguably forges a second link, this time to two laws dealing with firstfruits in the book of Exodus. In Exod 23:19a the Israelites are instructed: "The choicest firstfruits of your land

42 Zahn, *Rewritten Scripture*, 103.

43 *Ibid.*, 103–4.

you shall bring to the temple of YHWH your God (בית יהוה אלהיך).” An identical instruction is later found in Exod 34:26a. The reference to a בית in these laws is striking, given that these two verses constitute the only two occurrences within the entire Pentateuch of the term בית with the meaning “temple.” It is therefore probable that the person responsible for the addition at 4Q365 23 considered that the setting of his own firstfruits festal laws at a בית aligned with these earlier texts in Exodus.

However, if the reference to the בית in 4Q365 23 is influenced by Exod 23:19a // 34:26a, the person responsible for the addition has significantly altered its presentation. First, the addition does not follow the specific working of Exod 23:19a // 34:26a, which refer to this space as תבית יהוה אלהיך “the temple of YHWH your God.” Instead, line 6 refers to it as [הב]ית אשר תבנו לי בארץ “the temple which you will build for me in the land.” This wording brings to the fore the association of the בית with a future scenario. Second, the בית in 4Q365 23 has taken on a specific function in the festivals, different from any that is attested in Exod 23:19a // 34:26a. In the latter texts, the בית is specified only as the generic location to which the Israelites are to bring their firstfruits. In 4Q365 23, by contrast, the בית setting is integral to the festival of wood: the wood is to be used “for all the work of the temple (מלאכת הבית)” (lines 5–6, 8). Third, 4Q365 23 describes the community’s interactions in and around the temple space in detail, with each tribe being set a specific day to present their offerings for the upkeep of the temple and its altar. As argued above, this description has its closest parallels in priestly materials describing the offerings brought to the wilderness sanctuary, rather than Exod 23:19a // 34:26a, or for that matter, the law of the firstfruits in Deut 26. Yet despite these differences, the insertion into Leviticus of instructions for the offering of new oil and wood at a בית arguably brings this book into greater alignment with Exodus: both books now reference a temple explicitly, and command that the Israelites bring their offerings of firstfruits to this site.

Lastly, there is also the interesting possibility that the fragment alludes to non-pentateuchal texts when using the precise formula הבית אשר תבנו לי בארץ. In particular, this wording is reminiscent of the reference to the anticipated First Temple found in 2 Samuel 7.⁴⁴ In v. 5 of this chapter, YHWH (via Nathan) challenges David, האתה תבנה לי בית לשבתי “Are you the one who shall build for me a house/temple for me to dwell in?” In v. 13a YHWH confirms that it is, in fact, David’s seed who shall perform this task: הוא יבנה בית לשמי “He shall build

44 As noted by Saul Olyan during a workshop on ritual supplements held at Brown University in May 2016. (His comment was relayed to me via Christophe Nihan, who was present at the workshop.)

a house/temple for my name.” The parallel between 4Q365 23:6 and 2 Sam 7:5 is especially striking, since in both cases a בית is said to be built (בנה) “for me” (the preposition ל + first person singular pronominal suffix). The strength of this correspondence suggests that the person responsible for the addition sought to align the temple in fragment 23 with the First Temple in Jerusalem, as it is portrayed in 2 Sam 7.

This interpretation gains weight when we consider a further suggestion made by Zahn regarding the reference in 4Q365 23:5 to the Israelites dwelling securely (יָשַׁב + בָּטָח) in the land. She notes the possible influence of 1 Kgs 5:5, a text which describes the time when Solomon was able to begin the building project of the First Temple: וישב יהודה וישראל לבטח... כל ימי שלמה “Judah and Israel dwelled securely ... all the days of Solomon.” Zahn argues that “an astute reader or hearer”⁴⁵ would have picked up on the connection between the use of יָשַׁב + לָבַטַח in 4Q365 23:5 and the passage in 1 Kgs 5:5. This would have created an association of sorts between the new offerings to be brought to the temple and other biblical traditions which describe temple building projects and communal offerings. In support of this interpretation, we can note that 1 Kgs 5 makes a link, similar to that of 4Q365 23, between Israel’s dwelling securely in the land and the bringing of wood to a central place (Jerusalem) for the building of the temple. Hence the addition seems to share thematic as well as verbal parallels with 1 Kgs 5. Both texts refer to the construction of a temple at a time when the Israelites “dwell securely” in the land, and to the role of wood in this building process. The introduction to the addition at 4Q365 23:5 might therefore be read as being intended to connect, albeit subtly, the temple revealed to Moses to the Solomonic temple.

However, while the wording of lines 4–6 may hint that this temple is ultimately that which YHWH revealed to David, it would be unfounded to suppose that the בית is exclusively associated with the Solomonic Temple. There is no specification in the fragment, as far as we can tell, that Jerusalem is to be the site of YHWH’s temple. In fact, the vague description of “the temple which you will build for me in the land” maintains the same reticence to identify a specific cultic site in ancient Israel as is evident in all other versions of Leviticus, and in the Pentateuch as a whole. Moreover, the presence of other allusions in the wording of the fragment, such as to D’s concept of a chosen place and the “temple of YHWH your God” of Exod 23:19a // 34:26a, not to mention the wilderness sanctuary of the priestly traditions, suggests that the link to 2 Sam 7 in

45 Zahn, *Rewritten Scripture*, 104.

the fragment was not an attempt to assert a one-to-one equivalence between the future בית and the Solomonic temple.⁴⁶

Rather, the significance of 4Q365 23's allusions to this range of texts is that it enables the fragment to keep multiple traditions in play. The many references to texts describing the temple or chosen place effectively positions the future temple in 4Q365 23 as the fulfillment of *all* the authoritative 'sanctuary traditions' in the ancient Israelite scriptures. It is a kind of hyper-authorized sanctuary, a complex *mélange* of virtually all the possible expressions of Israelite temple space. And now, to add to its authority, it is revealed by YHWH to his chosen prophet, Moses, as the direct continuation of the cult of the wilderness period.

A second strategy employed to legitimate the reference to a temple in Leviticus is to present this hyper-authorized sanctuary as filling a lacuna in the priestly laws themselves. To put it another way: while the verbal allusions to non-priestly texts confirm that the new temple in 4Q365 23 is not foreshadowed in the priestly traditions (since the author of the fragment had to draw on other scriptures when introducing it), the new temple is referenced at precisely the moment in the book of Leviticus where one might expect such a future sanctuary to be revealed. As already mentioned, while the addition is located in ch. 24 and retains its introduction, it nonetheless invokes in lines 4–5 the temporal statement of Lev 23:10aβ: "when you come into the land that I am giving to you (...)." This phrase, when it occurs in the festal calendar, signals that the instructions contained in Lev 23:9–22 enjoy a unique status when compared to the majority of the Leviticus rituals: they are to be practiced *only* once the Israelites had come into the land. These are festivals that will require the bringing of

46 The evidence of the 4Q365a fragments may support this idea, since the temple which they describe seems to correspond to certain features of the temple described in *TS*. In particular, the instructions at 4Q365a 2 ii concerning the building of the outer court are paralleled very closely in the description of the outer court of the temple at 11Q19 41:4–42:3. 11Q19 38 parallels 4Q365a 2 i not just in wording but even in the way in which the material has been organized; the empty space observed in 4Q365a 2 i 7 appears to be mirrored in 11Q19 38:11 where a similar empty space can also be observed, suggesting a potentially direct literary relationship (although the wording is not identical). Scholars agree that the temple described in *TS* differs in important ways from the descriptions of the First and Second Temples preserved in the *HB* and also from how these temple could ever have been constructed, see recently Lawrence H. Schiffman, "Architecture and Law: The Temple and Its Courtyards in the Temple Scroll," in *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord: Studies on the Temple Scroll*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, STDJ 75 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 215–32. If we presume, first, that 4Q365a describes a similar temple to *TS*, and, second, that 4Q365 and 4Q365a were originally a single manuscript, we can assume that the temple mentioned in 4Q365 23 was significantly different to Solomon's temple.

offerings, the making of sacrifices and an operational priesthood. Yet while such festal instructions *imply* the existence of a sanctuary in the future land, there is no description in Lev 23 of the site to which the Israelites are to bring the offerings associated with these festivals. The Israelites are instead commanded only in the case of the firstfruits of the harvest to bring their offering to the priest, who shall wave the sheaf לפני יהוה “before YHWH” (v. 11). The setting of the priest goes unspecified, both here and at v. 20 where the priest is again mentioned as waving (נוף) offerings before YHWH on the Israelites’ behalf.

This lacuna, which is most obvious at Lev 23:9–22, has implications for all the Leviticus rituals. Despite their specific setting at the אהל מועד, these rituals are all presented as having an authority that endures beyond the wilderness context. Their replication in the future is explicitly foreshadowed in laws that conclude with expressions such as חקת עולם לדרתים “an everlasting statute throughout your generations” (e.g., Lev 3:17; 10:9; 23:14; 24:3) or with the command that certain laws be observed בכל מושבתים “in all your settlements” (e.g., Lev 3:17; 7:26; 23:3, 14, 21, 31). Even when laws are not accompanied by such formulae, the divine voicing of all the priestly legislation imbues them with enduring authority. Yet, since the priestly materials do not elaborate on the relationship between the wilderness cult and later Israelite sanctuaries, it is unclear how future generations will fulfil these ritual instructions once they are in the land.

The addition at 4Q365 23 thus resolves an ambiguity that is inherent to Leviticus itself: namely, while there is an obligation to maintain the centralized cult revealed at Sinai in the post-wilderness setting, the spaces within which the rituals revealed at Sinai will be practiced remained unspecified. The ritual supplement resolves this by making explicit that a new structure—a בית—is to be built (בנה) for the cult in the land. Such a structure was already foreshadowed in other traditions of the Hebrew Scriptures, to which the fragment alludes when introducing the temple in lines 4–6. Yet the position of the addition within Leviticus, and the overwhelmingly ritual focus of its content, presents the sanctuary as primarily answering a question that arises from Leviticus’ own ritual materials.

The ritual addition at 4Q365 23 therefore builds on both priestly as well as non-priestly texts to confirm that the rightful continuation of the wilderness cult in the post-wilderness future was always intended to be a single, central temple. The addition witnesses to a version of Leviticus which breaks the priestly silence concerning the future of the cult with an explicit statement affirming that the wilderness sanctuary is not the final step in the construction of Israelite sanctuary space. A new temple must be built in the land so that the rituals revealed at Sinai might be practiced into the foreseeable future. This

temple will serve as the *socio-cultic center* of the Israelite community, unifying the Israelites in centralized worship of YHWH, just as the wilderness shrine did before it.

Implications for the Study of Cult Centralization

The analysis offered above of the wording and context of the addition at 4Q365 23 suggests that the temple mentioned in this fragment is the heir to the precedent of centralized worship in the אהל מועד at Sinai, as described in earlier versions of Leviticus (even though these may have no language for describing a future temple to be built in the land). By way of conclusion, I will now turn to discuss some of the implications of 4Q365 23 for established debates about whether or not the priestly traditions promote a discourse of centralization.

The study of the priestly traditions and cult centralization has long wrestled with the absence of any concrete reference in these traditions to the place at which the Israelites must worship in the land. The classical assumption, pervasive since Wellhausen, was that there was no need for the priestly authors to explicitly command the Israelites to worship at a single shrine in the land because centralization was already so well established by the book Deuteronomy that it could simply be taken for granted.⁴⁷ In addition, P's idea that the Israelite cult was founded at a single desert sanctuary (the אהל מועד) has long been seen to "assume" and "confirm" the Deuteronomic demand that there be only one place of worship.⁴⁸

However, a number of scholars have noted that the depiction in the priestly traditions of a mobile tent-shrine in the wilderness does not convey precisely the same conception of cultic space as that found in Deuteronomy. Not only does the אהל מועד move with the community as they sojourn in the wilderness, but its future in the land is never articulated in such a way as to stress its relationship with a particular site chosen by YHWH. Some scholars have therefore argued that the priestly materials promoted or, at the very least, tolerated a *de-centralized*, local cult in ancient Israel.⁴⁹

47 Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*, trans. J. Sutherland and Allan Menzies (New York: Meridian Books, 1957), 27–28.

48 Abraham Kuenen, *An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch*, trans. P. H. Wicksteed (London: Macmillan and Co., 1886), 27 n. 14.

49 Yehezkel Kaufmann, *The Religion of Israel: From Its Beginnings to the Babylonian Exile*, trans. Moshe Greenberg (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago, 1960), 181; Bernd J. Diebner,

The fragment suggests that both sides of this debate have placed undue emphasis on the comparison of P and D when assessing whether or not a book like Leviticus supports a centralized cult. The centrality of the *בית*, like the *אהל מועד* before it, arises not from its being statically associated with a chosen location. Rather, the centrality of this temple arise from its being the focus of the ritual prescriptions that the Israelite community is required to perform. In other words, the *rituals* themselves centralize the Israelite cult and community. This idea has no real counterpart in Deuteronomy's concept of a fixed, chosen place. It instead offers an alternative imagining of 'center,' and thus a distinctive argument for cult centralization—one which is predicated on the ritual cult's ability to unite the entire community in service to a shared sanctuary. It is *this* argument which 4Q365 23 primarily develops when justifying why a future temple is the natural continuation of the wilderness cult in the land.

4Q365 23 therefore preserves an important witness to the critical interconnection between ritual law and centralization in the Second Temple period. The fragment shows how the ritual laws of the Pentateuch paved the way for a more direct articulation of the character of the centralized cult of the future, even though there was no precedent within Leviticus or the priestly traditions for the mention of a temple. This precedent was to be found outside these traditions, in texts like Deut 26, Exod 23:19a // 34:26a, 2 Sam 7 and 1 Kgs 5. But the centrality of the temple was derived entirely in and through the fragment's ritual prescriptions, which are themselves a development of the logic of the priestly materials.

This development in 4Q365 23 of the priestly discourse of centralization in depicting the future temple is perhaps best understood against the background of the increasing importance of the ritual Torah in legitimating the Israelite cult in the Second Temple period. As the authority of the Torah solidified, the legitimacy of the cult of ancient Israel became increasingly related to

"Gottes Welt, Moses Zelt und das salomonische Heiligtum," in *Lectio difficilior probabilior? Lexégèse comme expérience de décloisonnement*, ed. Thomas Römer, DBAT 12 (Heidelberg: Wiss.-theol. Seminar, 1991), 127–54; Mary Douglas, *Leviticus as Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 87–96; Jacob Milgrom, "Does H Advocate the Centralization of Worship?," *JSTOT* 88 (2000): 59–76; Pekka Pitkänen, *Central Sanctuary and Centralization of Worship in Ancient Israel: From the Settlement to the Building of Solomon's Temple* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2003), 69–75; Thomas Römer, "Cult Centralization in Deuteronomy 12: Between Deuteronomistic History and Pentateuch," in *Das Deuteronomium zwischen Pentateuch und Deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk*, eds. Eckart Otto and Reinhard Achenbach, FRLANT 206 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 168–80 (178–80); James Watts, *Leviticus 1–10*, HCOT (Leuven/Paris/Walpole WA: Peeters, 2013), 104–7.

the degree to which it could demonstrate its continuity with the ritual practice established by YHWH at Sinai. This does not mean that the actual ritual practice of historical temples ever precisely mirrored that which is described in the Pentateuch. However, 4Q365 23 suggests that one important way in which historical temples could support their claims to legitimately manifest the kind of centralized cult that was revealed by YHWH to Moses was by aligning the ritual practice of later temples with the ritual practice of the Mosaic Torah.

This point takes on additional significance when we consider that the textual tradition of 4Q365 probably originated at a time when there were two central temples in ancient Israel, namely the temples of Gerizim and Jerusalem. It is interesting to note that 4Q365 23, as we have seen, preserves the same ambiguity regarding the site of the post-wilderness cult as is characteristic of all other versions of the Pentateuch: it refers to the temple in only the most generalized of terms—“the temple which you will build for me in the land”—while never explicitly ruling out that the future temple revealed to Moses might have been that of Gerizim or of Jerusalem (though it does strongly hint via its allusion to 2 Sam 7 and 1 Kgs 5 that the temple was indeed eventually constructed in Jerusalem). Instead, by placing ritual continuity with the cult revealed to Moses at Sinai front and center in determining the legitimacy of the future temple, 4Q365 continues the priestly trend of reducing geographical location to a secondary issue to that of unifying, and thus centralizing, ritual practice. 4Q365 23 may therefore reflect the role that the ritual legislation of the Pentateuch played in allowing priestly scribes to navigate the coexistence of more than one major sanctuary in ancient Israel, but while still promoting the need for a centralizing ritual cult to be always practiced in accordance with the Torah of Moses.

Bibliography

- Brooke, George J. “4Q158: Reworked Pentateuch^a or Reworked Pentateuch A?” *DSD* 8 (3) (2001), 219–41.
- Brooke, George J. “Power to the Powerless: A Long-Lost Song of Miriam.” *BAR* 20 (3) (1994), 62–65.
- Brooke, George J. “The Rewritten Law, Prophets and Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible.” In *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judean Desert Discoveries*, eds. Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov (London: British Library, 2002), 31–40.
- Brooke, George J. “The Ten Temples in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” In *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel. Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*, ed. John Day. *LHBOTS* 422 (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2005), 417–34.

- Carr, David M. "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: Chr. Kaiser—Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2001) 107–40.
- Clines, David J. A. "Nehemiah 10 as an Example of Early Jewish Biblical Exegesis." *JSOT* 21 (1981), 111–17.
- Diebner, Bernd J. "Gottes Welt, Moses Zelt und das salomonische Heiligtum." In *Lexégèse comme expérience de décloisonnement*, ed. Thomas Römer. *DBAT* 12 (Heidelberg: Wiss.-theol. Seminar, 1991) 127–54.
- Dillmann, August. *Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus* (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1897).
- Douglas, Mary. *Leviticus as Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).
- Elledge, C. D. *The Statutes of the King: The Temple Scroll's Legislation on Kingship LV12–LIX21*. CahRB 56 (Paris: Gabalda, 2004).
- Falk, Daniel K. *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures among the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: T&T Clark, 2007).
- García Martínez, Florentino. "New Perspectives on the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Perspectives in the Study of the Old Testament and Early Judaism: A Symposium in Honour of Adam S. Van Der Woude on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*, eds. Florentino García Martínez and Ed Noort. *VTSup* 73 (Leiden: Brill, 1998) 230–48.
- García Martínez, Florentino. "Temple Scroll." In *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000) 927–33.
- Hieke, Thomas. *Levitikus, Zweiter Teilband: 16–27, übersetzt und ausgelegt von Thomas Hieke*, Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament 38 (Freiburg/Basel/Vienna: Herder, 2014).
- Kaufmann, Yehezkel. *The Religion of Israel: From Its Beginnings to the Babylonian Exile*, trans. Moshe Greenberg (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1960).
- Kuenen, Abraham. *An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch*, trans. P. H. Wicksteed (London: Macmillan and Co., 1886).
- Lange, Armin. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Date of the Final Stage of the Pentateuch." In *On Stone and Scroll: Essays in Honour of Graham Ivor Davies*, eds. James K. Aitken, Katharine J. Dell and Brian A. Mastin. *BZAW* 420 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 287–304.
- Lange, Armin. *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer, Band 1* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009).
- Maier, Johann. *The Temple Scroll: An Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985).
- Marx, Alfred. *Lévitique 17–27*. Commentaire de l'ancien Testament 3b (Geneva: Labor et Fides, 2011).

- Milgrom, Jacob. "Does H Advocate the Centralization of Worship?" *JOT* 88 (2000), 59–76.
- Milgrom, Jacob. *Leviticus 23–27*. AB 3C (New York: Doubleday, 2001).
- Milgrom, Jacob. "Qumran's Biblical Hermeneutics: The Case of the Wood Offering." *RevQ* 16 (3) (1994), 449–56.
- Najman, Hindy. "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. LSTS 33 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 202–16.
- Nihan, Christophe. *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch: A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus*. FAT II 25 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007).
- Paganini, Simone. *'Nicht darfst du zu diesen Wörtern etwas hinzufügen': Die Rezeption des Deuteronomiums in der Tempelrolle: Sprache, Autoren und Hermeneutik*. BZABR 11 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verl., 2009).
- Pakkala, Juha. "Quotations and References of the Pentateuchal Laws in Ezra-Nehemiah." In *Changes in Scripture. Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period*, eds. Hanne von Weissenberg, Juha Pakkala and Marko Marttila. BZAW 419 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 123–36.
- Pitkänen, Pekka. *Central Sanctuary and Centralization of Worship in Ancient Israel: From the Settlement to the Building of Solomon's Temple* (Piscataway: Gorgias, 2003).
- Reinmuth, Titus. "Reform und Tora bei Nehemia. Neh 10,31–40 und die Autorisierung der Tora in der Perserzeit." *ZAR* 7 (2001), 287–317.
- Römer, Thomas. "Cult Centralization in Deuteronomy 12: Between Deuteronomistic History and Pentateuch." In *Das Deuteronomium zwischen Pentateuch und Deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk*, eds. Eckart Otto and Reinhard Achenbach. FRLANT 206 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 168–80.
- Ruwe, Andreas. *'Heiligkeitgesetz' und 'Priesterschrift': Literaturgeschichtliche und rechtssystematische Untersuchungen zu Leviticus 17:1–26:2*. FAT I 26 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999).
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. "Architecture and Law: The Temple and Its Courtyards in the Temple Scroll." In *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord: Studies on the Temple Scroll*, ed. Florentino García Martínez. STDJ 75 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 215–32.
- Segal, Michael. "4QReworked Pentateuch or 4QPentateuch." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery*, eds. Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society/Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000), 319–99.
- Tov, Emanuel. "From 4QReworked Pentateuch to 4QPentateuch(?)" In *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*, ed. Mladen Popović, JSJSup 141 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010), 73–91.

- Tov, Emanuel. "The Textual Status of 4Q364–367 (4QRP)." In *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March, 1991*, eds. Julio Treballe Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner, STDJ 11 (Leiden/New York/Köln/Madrid: Brill, 1992), 1:43–82.
- Tov, Emanuel, and Sidnie White. "Reworked Pentateuch." In *Qumran Cave 4. XIII. Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*, eds. Harold W. Attridge, Torleif Elgvin, Józef Tadeusz Milik, Saul Olyan, John Strugnell, Emanuel Tov, James C. VanderKam and Sidnie Ann White. DJD 13 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 187–351.
- Ulrich, Eugene. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Text." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, eds. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 79–100.
- Vaux, Roland de. *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*, trans. John McHugh. Vol. 2 (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1973).
- Wacholder, B.-Z. *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1983).
- Wagner, Volker. Zur Existenz des sogenannten 'Heiligkeitsgesetzes.' ZAW 86 (1974), 307–16.
- Watts, James. *Leviticus 1–10*. HCOT (Leuven/Paris/Walpole: Peeters, 2013).
- Werman, Cana. "The Wood-Offering: The Convoluted Evolution of a Halakhah in Qumran and Rabbinic Law." In *New Perspectives on Old Texts. Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 9–11 January, 2005*, eds. Esther G. Chazon and Betsy Halpern-Amaru. STDJ 88 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010), 151–81.
- White Crawford, Sidnie. "4QTemple? (4Q385a) Revisited." In *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the Occasion of Her 65th Birthday*, eds. Jeremy Penner, Ken M. Penner and Cecilia Waszen. STDJ 98 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2012), 87–95.
- White Crawford, Sidnie. "The Pentateuch as Found in the Pre-Samaritan Texts and 4QReworked Pentateuch." In *Changes in Scripture. Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period*, eds. Hanne von Weissenberg, Juha Pakkala and Marko Marttila. BZAW 419 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 123–36.
- White Crawford, Sidnie, and Christopher A. Hoffmann. "A Note on 4Q365, Frg. 23 and Nehemiah 10:33–36." *RevQ* 23 (3) (2008), 429–30.
- Yadin, Yigael. *The Temple Scroll*. Revised and English ed. Vol. 1 (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983).
- Zahn, Molly M. "4QReworked Pentateuch C and the Literary Sources of the 'Temple Scroll': A New (Old) Proposal." *DSD* 19 (2) (2012), 133–58.
- Zahn, Molly M. *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts*. STDJ 103 (Leiden: Brill, 2011).