

## I

**Rewriting, Revision, and Reuse***Language and Methods*

The first challenge in fully understanding rewriting in early Judaism, in all its diverse contexts and manifestations, is finding language that is up to the task. A second is recognizing methodological pitfalls that may skew our interpretation of the evidence. Though these challenges may not seem particularly related, they represent two sides of the same coin. The terms we use are not interchangeable name tags, but in fact reflect particular interpretations or construals of the data under discussion.<sup>1</sup> Categories and labels built on incomplete evidence or anachronistic frameworks actually constrain the ways we approach our data and the possibilities we entertain when analyzing it. As such, the question of terminology becomes a question of method: our ways of conceptualizing the data, reflected in the terms and categories we use, predispose us to respond to new data in particular ways. When it comes to the study of rewriting, errors of method have often resulted from precisely our traditional ways of thinking (and talking) about scripture and interpretation; we are only gradually realizing the degree to which those frameworks fail to fit our data.

In a way, this entire project is about language and method: how we can develop ways of thinking and talking about rewriting that do justice to the wealth of Second Temple evidence that we now have. Here in this

<sup>1</sup> Ulrich, “Methodological Reflections,” 151–52. See also the incisive observations of Campbell, “‘Rewritten Bible’ and ‘Parabiblical Texts,’” 63 (“it is fair to say that this unsatisfactory state of affairs is largely a by-product of muddling through with outmoded nomenclature, as scholars are sucked into an ideological framework imposed by obsolete terminology”), as well as my comments in Zahn, “Talking about Rewritten Texts,” 93–94.

1 *Orality, Memory, and Text Production in Early Judaism* 29

chapter, I lay the groundwork for the more specific chapters that follow by presenting the language I will use to talk about rewriting, a set of terms that I believe helps us to avoid many of the conceptual/methodological problems that have limited our understanding thus far. The delineation of these terms – the broad category “rewriting,” divided into two subcategories, “revision” and “reuse” – carries with it a series of basic methodological questions that will occupy the second part of the chapter: How are the subcategories distinguished from one another “in the field”? And how is (or better, how should) rewriting be identified and described in the first place? How do we know rewriting when we see it, and how do we appropriately compensate for the limits of our ability to see? Before we get to these specific terminological and methodological issues, however, some general orientation to the circumstances of ancient Jewish textuality is necessary. If the goal is to redraw and extend the map of rewriting in the Second Temple period, we need to make sure we are doing so against the appropriate background.

I ORALITY, MEMORY, AND TEXT PRODUCTION  
 IN EARLY JUDAISM

I have already noted in the Introduction some differences between ancient and modern expectations about textuality, particularly the fluidity and pluriformity of ancient Jewish texts, and the willingness of many tradents to make changes to the texts they transmitted. Another key difference has to do with how texts were experienced – not, most frequently, as written words on a scroll, but as words recited or performed orally. I focus heavily in what follows on written texts and manuscripts, and on the scribes who produced them. I talk about changes made to texts or reconfiguration of existing texts by later tradents. My approach is based on written texts out of necessity, since they provide our only access to the shape of ancient literary traditions. All of this focus on writing, however, can easily give an impression of scribes as not so different from modern-day authors and editors – educated individuals sitting alone with written copies of their sources before them (much as I sit in my office as I write this, surrounded by piles of books and articles). Recent research on the production and use of texts in the ancient world, and in Second Temple Judaism in particular, has shown that such an image is well off the mark.

The fact that ancient Jewish literary culture is accessible to us almost entirely through written texts, combined with our own embeddedness in

30 *Rewriting, Revision, and Reuse: Language and Methods*

modern textual cultures, makes it difficult – but all the more essential – to keep in mind that this was a largely oral/aural environment.<sup>2</sup> As was true throughout the ancient world, only a small percentage of Judeans in the Second Temple period would have been fully literate, in the sense of being able to read and write complex texts.<sup>3</sup> Even those who could would largely have experienced text through hearing – silent, solitary reading was not the norm.<sup>4</sup> Texts were meant to be performed.

A related element of ancient textual culture is the importance of memorization. As David Carr has pointed out, all ancient Mediterranean cultures made the ability to recite prestigious cultural texts orally a key component of elite education. Highly trained individuals would show their mastery of the tradition by carrying large parts of it “written on the tablet of the heart,” retrievable by memory.<sup>5</sup> Judith Newman connects this focus on internalization of the tradition with the ways education (Greek *paideia*) was conceptualized in the Hellenistic period. Instruction was imagined primarily as face-to-face interaction with a sage; the ideal sage knew the key texts of the tradition backward and forward, and could repackage and re-present their contents as part of the pedagogical process.<sup>6</sup>

In addition to the mobilization of memorized text in educational settings, we have other kinds of evidence from the Second Temple period

<sup>2</sup> See the groundbreaking work of Susan Niditch, *Oral World and Written Word: Ancient Israelite Literature* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996); Martin S. Jaffee, *Torah in the Mouth: Writing and Oral Tradition in Palestinian Judaism 200 BCE –400 CE* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001); David Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005). For a broader perspective see also Graham, *Beyond the Written Word*, 31–47.

<sup>3</sup> Jaffee, *Torah in the Mouth*, 15n7; Samuel L. Adams, “The Social Location of the Scribe in the Second Temple Period,” in *Sibyls, Scriptures, and Scrolls: John Collins at Seventy*, vol. 1, ed. Joel Baden, Hindy Najman, and Eibert Tigchelaar, JSJSup 175 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 27–28.

<sup>4</sup> Jaffee, *Torah in the Mouth*, 16; Mladen Popović, “Reading, Writing, and Memorizing Together: Reading Culture in Ancient Judaism and the Dead Sea Scrolls in a Mediterranean Context,” *DSD* 24 (2017): 449; Graham, *Beyond the Written Word*, 32–36.

<sup>5</sup> Carr, *Writing on the Tablet*, 9.

<sup>6</sup> Judith H. Newman, *Before the Bible: The Liturgical Body and the Formation of Scriptures in Early Judaism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018), 41–45; compare Carr’s similar comments on ancient Mesopotamia, *Writing on the Tablet*, 41–46. See also Jonathan D. H. Norton, *Contours in the Text: Textual Variation in the Writings of Paul, Josephus, and the Yahad*, LNTS 430 (London: Bloomsbury, 2011), 115: “A fundamentally oral culture situates knowledge within a context of discussion among authoritative, charismatic speakers.”

1 *Orality, Memory, and Text Production in Early Judaism* 31

that reading and writing were “deeply social” activities.<sup>7</sup> For example, Philo’s descriptions of the Essenes and the Therapeutae paint a picture of communal Sabbath assemblies during which the gathered members listened as sacred texts were read and then expounded as the basis for instruction.<sup>8</sup> Similarly, a famous passage in the Qumran Community Rule (1QS 6:6–8) highlights the centrality (and interweaving) of group reading, study, and prayer in the *yahad*’s imagination:

And in (any) place where the Ten are (gathered), there shall not lack a man to search in the torah day and night continually, one relieving the other. And the Many shall keep watch together for one third of every night of the year, to read in the book and to explain the ordinance and to bless together.

As Popović and Hempel note, this passage and others suggest that the *yahad* functioned as a “textual community” in Brian Stock’s sense of the term: a “micro-societ[y] organized around the common, shared, understanding of texts.”<sup>9</sup> While such passages do not exclude the possibility of private reading or text study, they point to the social significance of reading and interpretation and its role in fostering a cohesive community.<sup>10</sup>

These indicators of the communal, oral/aural setting in which written texts were encountered should impact the way we think about text *production* in early Judaism. This is especially the case for texts, like those considered in this book, that are marked by clear engagement with earlier materials. Texts that extend or interpret existing prestigious traditions may well trace their origins to community settings where the existing traditions were read and studied, and where learned leaders might draw on the stores of text that they knew by heart to explicate

<sup>7</sup> Popović, “Reading, Writing, and Memorizing,” 449.

<sup>8</sup> Popović, “Reading, Writing, and Memorizing,” 455; the passages in Philo are *Good Person* 81–82 (on the Essenes) and *Hypothetica* 7.13 (on the Therapeutae).

<sup>9</sup> Popović, “Reading, Writing, and Memorizing,” 450; Charlotte Hempel, “Reflections on Literacy, Textuality, and Community in the Qumran Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Is There a Text in This Cave? Studies in the Textuality of the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of George J. Brooke*, ed. Ariel Feldman, Maria Cioatǎ, and Charlotte Hempel, STDJ 119 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 76–77. The reference is to Brian Stock, *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983). On this passage see also the important article by George Brooke, “Reading, Searching and Blessing: A Functional Approach to Scriptural Interpretation in the ׀׀,” in McLay, *The Temple in Text and Tradition*, 140–56; as well as Jaffee, *Torah in the Mouth*, 32–36; Norton, *Contours*, 115–19.

<sup>10</sup> Popović, “Reading, Writing, and Memorizing,” 449.

32 *Rewriting, Revision, and Reuse: Language and Methods*

one text or tradition in light of others.<sup>11</sup> Such settings could be liturgical in nature – Newman, Carol Newsom, and George Brooke have all argued for the origins of certain poetic compositions in group settings where a learned interpreter would reformulate existing tradition in the context of a prayer or hymn – or more pedagogical, as in the kind of oral reformulation of the tradition that Newman posits on the basis of Ben Sira.<sup>12</sup> In other words, both the content and the form of new compositions is shaped by the communal setting. The content may reflect specific traditions or trajectories of interpretation that result from group study, and the new text is likely intended from the beginning to be proclaimed or performed orally in a group setting. A text may have been written down to aid in its performance, or might have been prepared orally/from memory and only written down afterwards.

In this context, what do we know about the people who did the writing down? I refer to these writers as “scribes” and characterize rewriting as a “scribal” activity.<sup>13</sup> I use this term to denote the highly educated individuals who were responsible for the composition and transmission of early Jewish literary texts – but my usage must be seen in light of the textual culture sketched earlier. The English word “scribe” (from Latin *scribere*, to write) has inevitable connections to the *written* word – and I believe this is appropriate, given the written manuscripts that form the basis of this study.<sup>14</sup> But these scribes, insofar as they were masters of Israel’s

<sup>11</sup> Jaffee, *Torah in the Mouth*, 19; Brooke, “Reading, Searching and Blessing”; Newman, *Before the Bible*, 124; Norton, *Contours*, 119.

<sup>12</sup> See Brooke, “Reading, Searching and Blessing,” 153–54; Newman, *Before the Bible*, 53–74, 107–39; Carol A. Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran*, STDJ 52 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 196–204; Carol A. Newsom, “Deriving Negative Anthropology through Exegetical Activity: The Hodoyot as Case Study,” in Feldman et al., *Is There a Text in This Cave?*, 258–74.

<sup>13</sup> See most recently Sidnie White Crawford, *Scribes and Scrolls at Qumran* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2019).

<sup>14</sup> Note that my use of the term “scribe” is definitely an etic one. Our manuscript evidence witnesses the activities of highly educated individuals with a deep knowledge of Jewish traditions of various kinds (literary, ritual, scientific, etc.). I do not assume that all of these individuals necessarily belonged to a single social group or class, nor that they (all) would necessarily have been regarded as “scribes” (Hebrew *sofer*; Greek *grammateus*) in their own day – in fact, the term *sofer* occurs only once in the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls (Adams, “Social Location,” 34). Second Temple evidence does not give a clear picture of what it meant to be a scribe in this period. As Teeter puts it, “What is certain is that multiple and diverse conceptions of scribes existed, and that they functioned in a variety of different social roles.” See D. Andrew Teeter, “Scribes and Scribalism,” in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, ed. John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 1203; Jaffee, *Torah in the Mouth*, 20–22; Adams,

1 *Orality, Memory, and Text Production in Early Judaism* 33

literary tradition, did much more than write – they must have been active participants in (and perhaps leaders of) the performative and pedagogical contexts described earlier.<sup>15</sup> And when they did write, their writing process would have been influenced by the importance of orality and memory in their textual culture.<sup>16</sup> A scribe making a new copy of a text would know that text as a living tradition, and thus the new copy could reflect elements of the tradition as performed or discussed, recalled from the scribe’s memory, even if they had never existed in a written copy of that text before.<sup>17</sup> Scribes who drew on existing texts to formulate new works likely recalled most, if not all, of their sources from memory – and again, these sources could include traditions known only orally, as well as prestigious texts that were written down and memorized.

The point here is not to suggest that the significant role of orality and memory in this textual culture contributed to textual fluidity because memory is less precise than writing.<sup>18</sup> Despite all the evidence for such fluidity, the frequency of detailed textual overlaps between preserved manuscripts, and the studied, scholarly, obviously deliberate nature of many variants show that texts were generally employed with precision,

“Social Location”; Crawford, *Scribes and Scrolls*, 49–105; and for an overview of the usage of the ancient terms, Christine Schams, *Jewish Scribes in the Second-Temple Period*, JSOTSup 291 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998).

<sup>15</sup> Note Newman’s call for additional focus on the lived, embodied experience of Second Temple scribes and sages; *Before the Bible*, 3, 11–17. Also important is Norton’s note (*Contours*, 107) that we should resist the collapse of “exegetical” and “scribal” – that is, some scribes “were technicians who did not engage in exegesis,” while those leaders and teachers responsible for the content of the developing tradition need not have been actually engaged physically in text production.

<sup>16</sup> For the role of memory and memorization as distinct from orality per se, see David M. Carr, “Orality, Textuality, and Memory: The State of Biblical Studies,” in *Contextualizing Israel’s Sacred Writings: Ancient Literacy, Orality, and Literary Production*, ed. Brian B. Schmidt, AIL 22 (Atlanta: SBL, 2015), 161–73.

<sup>17</sup> Norton, *Contours*, 55, 87.

<sup>18</sup> All scribes made errors, whether copying visually or from dictation, and presumably scribes could misremember a memorized text as well. But the kinds of “memory variants” charted by Carr (*The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011], 25–34; “Orality, Textuality,” 166–69) differ qualitatively from graphic and aural errors: they constitute what Carr (drawing on Milman Perry) refers to as “good variants” – they fit the syntax and content of the text; they make good sense in context. It is inappropriate to describe such variants as “errors,” in the sense that the scribe is judged to have misremembered the text. Such judgments, for one thing, are implicitly biased toward the versions of the text that we know. For another, in most cases it is likely that the scribe did not “misremember” but rather substitutes a known alternative reading. Such changes must sometimes have occurred automatically, but surely were frequently deliberate.

34 *Rewriting, Revision, and Reuse: Language and Methods*

whether copied from a page or recalled from memory. Rather, the environment of writing-supported orality helps us understand the context for constant reshaping of texts – if texts were generally experienced orally and routinely accompanied by elaboration or explication of various sorts, the notion of what constituted a “text” in early Judaism was more expansive than just words on a scroll. Whatever the specific conditions under which scribes wrote (alone, or in a group; with a copy-text in front of them or from dictation or from memory), the written texts they produced were only one element in the vibrant and ongoing discourse that constituted Israel’s literary heritage.

## 2 FINDING THE RIGHT WORDS

### *Rewriting*

When we turn our focus specifically to rewriting, then, we must keep in mind that the various textual phenomena charted here took place as part of this rich culture of oral-written textuality. Against this background, my decision to talk about “rewriting,” as opposed to a number of possible alternatives, is a very conscious one. As indicated in the Introduction, much of the scholarly conversation surrounding deliberate, unmarked modification of earlier texts (i.e., what I call rewriting) has been carried out under the rubric of the terms “Rewritten Bible” and “Rewritten Scripture.” Some scholars reject the idea of Rewritten Bible/Scripture as a genre or textual category, preferring to refer to “rewriting scripture” or “rewriting the Bible” as a *technique*.<sup>19</sup> But this entire conversation fails to do justice to the dynamic reality of Second Temple literary culture. It construes rewriting as something that happened solely, or at least primarily, to *scriptural* texts, a presumption that is very difficult to justify.<sup>20</sup> First

<sup>19</sup> For example, Daniel J. Harrington, “The Bible Rewritten (Narratives),” in *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters*, ed. Robert A. Kraft and George W. E. Nickelsburg (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 243; George J. Brooke, “Rewritten Bible,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 2, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 780; Falk, *Parabiblical Texts*, 17.

<sup>20</sup> For this reason, I am increasingly inclined to view the terminological shift from Rewritten Bible to Rewritten Scripture as of less importance than it might seem. It does avoid the blatant anachronism of talking about “Bible” before there is a Bible to be rewritten. It also allows for the possibility that certain texts that were considered scripture but did not end up in the Bible were subject to rewriting. But it does not fundamentally change how the scope of the phenomenon is conceptualized, insofar as most scholars would consider

of all, there is no consensus on exactly what texts were regarded as scripture, and for whom, in Second Temple Judaism.<sup>21</sup> Secondly, even if this could be determined, it would then have to be demonstrated (rather than assumed) that only scriptural texts were subject to rewriting. Therefore, labels that include Bible/biblical or Scripture/scriptural should not be used to refer to the deliberate modification of earlier texts as a phenomenon.

This difficulty has been noted by others, regarding both Rewritten Bible/Scripture and other terms such as “parabiblical.”<sup>22</sup> Various alternatives have been proposed, but two are especially worthy of comment: *paratext* and *hypertext*. Both of these terms avoid the canonical limitations of earlier language and thus might seem promising. But each ultimately is too broad for my purposes, encompassing not only the deliberate re-presentation of specific earlier texts, but also a variety of other types of textual relationships.

Paratext has been proposed by Armin Lange as an alternative to earlier terms such as Rewritten Bible. Lange builds on the established idea of parabiblical literature, while seeking to avoid anachronism by replacing “biblical” with “textual.”<sup>23</sup> But Lange’s unconventional use of paratext to designate reworkings of earlier materials seems prone to misunderstanding, in a couple of ways. First, the prefix “para-” (“beside”; “beyond”) does not straightforwardly refer only to later reworking, but could reasonably signify a whole host of textual relationships.<sup>24</sup> In his 2006 SBL Presidential Address, Robert Kraft points out that, although

the corpus of “scripture” in the Second Temple period to have consisted of the books that later ended up in the Hebrew Bible, plus or minus a few texts (such as Jubilees or 1 Enoch). We still end up viewing rewriting as something that was done to a limited number of texts seen as especially sacred/authoritative. See the similar comments of Jonathan G. Campbell, “Rewritten Bible: A Terminological Reassessment,” in Zsengellér, *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years*, 73–75.

<sup>21</sup> See Zahn, “Talking about Rewritten Texts,” 98–100, and the literature cited there, as well as Chapter 7.

<sup>22</sup> E.g., Campbell, “‘Rewritten Bible’ and ‘Parabiblical Texts’”; Armin Lange, “In the Second Degree: Ancient Jewish Paratextual Literature in the Context of Graeco-Roman and Ancient Near Eastern Literature,” in *In the Second Degree: Paratextual Literature in Ancient Near Eastern and Ancient Mediterranean Culture and Its Reflections in Medieval Literature*, ed. Philip S. Alexander, Armin Lange, and Renate Pillinger (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 3–42; George J. Brooke, “Hypertextuality and the ‘Parabiblical’ Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Reading the Dead Sea Scrolls: Essays in Method*, ed. George J. Brooke (Atlanta: SBL, 2013), 67–84.

<sup>23</sup> Lange, “In the Second Degree,” 19–20.

<sup>24</sup> See *OED*, s.v. “para-”: “Forming miscellaneous terms in the sense ‘analogous or parallel to, but separate from or going beyond, what is denoted by the root word.’”



36 *Rewriting, Revision, and Reuse: Language and Methods*

scholars have tended to assume that parabiblical texts are later than biblical ones, properly, “para” could denote things like common sources, parallel or independent developments of the same traditional material, or earlier forms of the text, as well as later reworkings or retellings.<sup>25</sup> Thus restricting paratext to refer only to *later* reworkings seems artificial and confusing. Also problematic is the fact that paratext/paratextual is defined quite differently in other branches of the humanities and sometimes within biblical studies itself. Based on the influential work of the French literary critic Gérard Genette, paratext is taken to refer to all the materials external to “the text properly speaking” that accompany it and provide clues to its interpretation: titles, prefaces, forewords, illustrations, marginal notes, dust jackets, etc.<sup>26</sup>

George Brooke, noting the problems with paratext, argues that Genette’s later term hypertext is more appropriate. Unlike paratext, which might plausibly refer to a parallel version or earlier source, hypertext clearly denotes a later text; a situation of relation to or dependence upon something prior. For Brooke, hypertext also has the advantage of breadth, in that it can include a variety of different types of reuse or interaction. These include mimicking the style, characters, language, or structure of an earlier text, without actually reproducing specific existing

<sup>25</sup> See Kraft, “Para-mania,” 18–22. Kraft further suggests that our willingness to use “parabiblical” automatically to denote something *later than* the biblical text is rooted in old assumptions about the primacy – temporal as well as theological – of the biblical text.

<sup>26</sup> See Gérard Genette, *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*, trans. Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), 3. Though, as Lange notes, Genette originally used paratext in the sense that Lange does, the later sense is the one that seems to have caught on in various realms of criticism. See for example the review by Thomas Dougherty, “The Paratext’s the Thing,” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Jan 6, 2014 (<https://chronicle.com/article/The-Paratexts-the-Thing/143761/>). Dougherty focuses largely on the role paratexts have assumed in media studies. See also the titles of *Renaissance Paratexts*, ed. Helen Smith and Louise Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); and Laura Jansen, *The Roman Paratext: Frame, Texts, Readers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014). For the term used in this sense in the study of ancient Judaism and early Christianity, see e.g. Ingrid E. Lilly, *Two Books of Ezekiel: Papyrus 967 and the Masoretic Text as Variant Literary Editions*, VTSup 150 (Leiden: Brill, 2012); Liv Ingeborg Lied, “Between ‘Text Witness’ and ‘Text on the Page’: Trajectories in the History of Editing the Epistle of Baruch,” in *Snapshots of Evolving Traditions*, ed. Liv Ingeborg Lied and Hugo Lundhaug (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2017), 272–96; Eva Mroczek, “The End of the Psalms in the Dead Sea Scrolls, Greek Codices, and Syriac Manuscripts,” in Lied and Lundhaug, *Snapshots of Evolving Traditions*, 297–322.

textual units.<sup>27</sup> But what for Brooke is an advantage, the breadth of the category, makes it a bit too expansive for my purposes here. There is a great deal still to be understood about the deliberate reuse of specific earlier texts in early Judaism, and I cannot fully consider here all the other forms of textual relationship that fall under the rubric of hypertextuality. It will become clear, however, that I am not interested in drawing firm boundaries or establishing absolute categories. I will explore in Chapter 6 the fuzzy edges where rewriting shades into looser forms of hypertextuality. But the majority of this project focuses on cases where we have evidence that specific existing textual units were reworked by later scribes.

In the end, then, neither paratext nor hypertext fully suffices to capture the phenomenon I focus on here. Though I am in full agreement with Brooke and others that the terms *Rewritten Scripture* and *Rewritten Bible* are simply too problematic to be retained, I think that *rewriting* alone, stripped of its modifiers, is both specific enough and neutral enough to serve as a label for the deliberate, unmarked reproduction and modification of one text by another.<sup>28</sup> Rewriting, as I will show, is not to be associated solely with biblical or scriptural texts, nor with any other particular text type (or even any particular type of textual manipulation).

### *Revision and Reuse*

The canonical language that has most often been used to designate rewriting as a phenomenon has also dominated discussion of different

<sup>27</sup> Brooke, “Hypertextuality,” 70. The breadth of Brooke’s category is also reflected in Section 7 of the Manchester/Durham Inventory; see Samely, *Profiling Jewish Literature in Antiquity*, 64–71. Genette divides hypertexts into two basic categories: imitations and transformations. Transformation corresponds roughly to what I would call rewriting: changes of various types (linguistic, stylistic, thematic, etc.) made to a single text. Imitations, on the other hand, have a much looser relationship to individual texts. They are not “rewritings” in the sense of reworkings of earlier texts, but rather compositions written “in the style of” a given author or genre but not tethered to the contents, characters, or themes of a given work. See especially Genette, *Palimpsests*, 81–85.

<sup>28</sup> Campbell, “Rewritten Bible: A Terminological Reassessment,” 76, moves in a similar direction, though proposes that modifiers like “Rewritten Sectarian Work” or “Rewritten Popular Narrative” could function alongside a category such as “Rewritten Scripture.” To my mind, such an idea puts too much weight on universal ideas of “scripture” – for instance, would not a “sectarian” work such as the Community Rule (*Serekh ha-Yahad*) be viewed as authoritative/scriptural by the group that produced and preserved it? On the ways in which the *Serekh* claims scriptural authority for itself, see, with literature, Molly M. Zahn, “Torah for ‘The Age of Wickedness’: The Authority of the Damascus and Serekh Texts in Light of Biblical and Rewritten Traditions,” *DSD* 20 (2013): 410–32.