Introduction

Erkki Koskenniemi and J. Cornelis de Vos

In the "traditional" sense of the concept, the rewritten Bible only dealt with narrative texts.[1] In the meantime, however, a growing number of scholars use the term "rewritten Bible" not only for a specific genre but also for a method of reusing biblical texts. This method may include erasing, expanding, altering, and reordering words or phrases from the pre-existing text; leaving out content significant for the pre-existing text; or giving the pre-existing text another context.

The precondition for rewriting biblical texts is that the reused texts have a certain amount of authority. The pre-existing text has a value that can be reused and adapted for new settings. Also the reverse can be the case: the pre-existing text can obtain its value by its reuse.

We must be aware that the whole concept of Bible is anachronistic for most of the period dealt with in this volume (see esp. the contribution of Michael Becker). By the process of rewriting, both the pre-existing text and the new text obtain meaning and authority. The full impact of this new meaning can only be recognised by intertextual analysis, by confronting the pre-existing biblical and the rewritten text and by "letting them communicate with each other."

The backgrounds for rewriting biblical texts are diverse. Historical, geographical, social, cultural, religious, or ethical settings[2] could have

---

[1] G. Vermès, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies* (StPB 4; Leiden: Brill, 1961; 2d ed. 1973); see for a recent chronological overview of "rewritten Bible" K. Dalgaard, "Rewritten Bible—Vermes' forbandelse," *Forum for Bibelsk Eksegese: Bibelske genskrivninger* 17 (2012), 19–49.

[2] We use the categorisations in an etic way. In antiquity religion and society, for example, were not separate entities.

changed making the original meaning of a biblical text obsolete, needing actualisation or even problematic. Also the reverse is the case: by reusing biblical texts their meaning unavoidably changes. Author and addressees of rewritten Bible texts live, of course, later than their pre-existing text. The very reuse of texts that goes beyond mere copying implies, hermeneutically, a repository of new meaning, deliberately or inadvertently. In fact, even a mere copying changes the meaning of a text because time has changed.

The line between rewriting and merely interpreting the pre-existing text is not always clear because rewriting always implies interpretation. However, in order to call a text rewritten Bible, the pre-existing biblical text must remain recognisable, and it must be clear that it does not just concern a kind of commentary, that is, biblical text followed by explanation or interpretation as seen in the pesharim. The examples given in this volume show, in our view, that biblical texts about holy spaces and cult have also been rewritten.

Biblical texts about holy places and cult were rewritten for different reasons. Original holy places could have lost their importance for the writer and its addressees; or they could gain or regain their importance. Holy places could alter their status and/or move to other locations; they could become particular or universal, earthly or heavenly, concrete or spiritual, static or dynamic etc. This is especially true after drastic changes such as the destruction of the First and Second Temple. By the method of rewriting the author was able to change original biblical concepts about holy spaces and re-contextualise them.

What applies to rewriting texts about holy spaces also applies to rewriting texts about cult. Throughout the ages and throughout the changes in the religious field, concepts about holiness and pureness have changed, influencing cultic prescriptions and performance. They have also changed because of normative alterations or developments. Ritual and moral purity are sometimes two sides of the same coin. And purity is a demand for all who approximate holy spaces.

In short, people live somewhere; they have their centre and periphery. People behave and act in certain ways; they have their cultic and moral concepts. Holy places mark the religious centre, anchored in that what is or becomes Bible, of the author and addressees of the rewritten holy place

texts; and it gives them a common identity. Cult does the same as it is performatively centred on holiness.

The following articles were initially presented at a conference of the international network "Rewritten Bible" in Karkku, Finland, from 25–28 August 2010. Several German, Finnish, and Dutch scholars from different disciplines presented papers on rewriting biblical texts about holy places, cult, or both. Most of the papers are included in this volume.

The order of the papers is mainly chronological except for the first two contributions. The first two deal with methodological questions. The following three are concerned with the Old Testament/Hebrew Bible. After the Old Testament/Hebrew Bible section the New Testament section follows with two contributions. The last two papers are dedicated to Church history.

Michael Becker investigates the fundamental question of how the Qumran *Temple Scroll* can be characterized. It is a kind of rewritten Bible but at the same time it goes far beyond this concept. "It is fundamental because it is a change in the hermeneutical principles of the 'Torah' presented now by the content of the scroll and its claim to narrate God's revelation directly" (below p. 21). The existing Torah is, of course, the authority. Otherwise the author or authors of the *Temple Scroll* would not have only rewritten this Torah. However, as they deal with this Torah quite freely and change it fundamentally, the Torah has no fixed canonical status for them.

Peder Borgen justly required that the expression "rewritten Bible" could also be used for legal material as treated in Philo's works.[3] There is, however, no methodology for the scrutiny of rewritten legal texts, and this is aimed at in the contribution written by Erkki Koskenniemi. He deals with legal material concerning ritual purification. The Mosaic rules had a history, at first inside of the "Old Testament," and then in early Judaism; they were clarified or clearly reinterpreted. Although the Pauline view on the meaning of biblical law prevailed and Gentiles were mostly not supposed to follow Moses' rulings, the legal texts also attracted Christian writers during the first centuries C.E. A history of a passage of Leviticus, requiring

[3] P. Borgen, *Philo of Alexandria. An Exegete for his Time* (NovTSup, 6; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 63–65.

ritual purification after sexual intercourse (Lev 15:16–18), along with the parallel texts Num 22:4 and Deut 23:11–12, shows how a fragment may find an interesting afterlife in early Judaism and among Christians. Similarly, the history of the text shows how legal texts could be distorted and made to speak for new sexual ideals, when the Roman popes required celibacy of the Christian ministers in the Western church.

Whole mountains can move to another region, especially if there are cultic sites attached to them. Antti Laato deals with Mount Ebal and argues by means of biblical and archaeological evidence that it was the location of an old Yahwistic cultic site. Ebal, in the vicinity of its neighbour mount Gerizim, both near Shechem, was—unlike cultic sites such as Dan and Bethel—never criticised by the Deuteronomistic Historian. Therefore, he inserted the old Ebal tradition into his work without, thereby, creating a rival to the Jerusalem cultic status. However, as Jerusalem had fallen and Samaria began to become a serious rival, the Deuteronomistic Historian reedited Deut 11:29–30 and Josh 8:30–35 in such a way that he located Ebal and the Samaritan cultic Mount Gerizim in the vicinity of Gilgal. As a response, the Samaritans changed the texts of Deut 11:29–30 by adding "opposite Shechem" and thus returning the relocated Mount Ebal and Mount Garizim to their proper location.

Magnar Kartveit endorses the view that "Mount Gerizim" was the original reading in Deut 27:4, not "Mount Ebal" as Antti Laato defends (see above). He reconstructs a literary-historical process of Deut 27:1–8 of four phases: (i) the original account was formed by the Deuteronomistic verses 1–3; there is no mention of an altar, only of stones inscribed with the words of the Torah; (ii) the priestly section 27:4–8 was added; it deals with the command to build an altar after having crossed the Jordan; (iii) at a later stage this altar is said to be built at Mount Gerizim. The construction of the Samaritan temple—not the destruction of this temple—could have led to a rewriting process. In Jerusalem, the place of the altar in Deut 27:4 was changed to "Mount Ebal" whereas the Samaritans made changes in the Pentateuch to support the legitimacy of their altar at Mount Gerizim.

Lotta Valve deals with a further mountain, Mount Horeb; and with Moses and Elijah who both are connected to this mountain. She argues that the editor/s of the appendix/-ces to the book of Malachi (Mal 3:22, 23–24)

deliberately used the figures of Moses and Elijah in order to make a connection to the text of Malachi itself. She shows how the editor/s associated the content of several biblical texts by the method which later came to be known as gezera shava. "Malachi" literally means "my messenger" and is equated with Elijah (Mal 3:1, 23). But it also refers to the text of the book of Malachi itself. Both, Elijah and the text of Malachi, stand for remembering (cf. "Book of Remembrance"; Mal 3:16) the people of the Torah as given by God via Moses to Israel and passed down to "a messenger" (Exod 23:20); and to the Torah through which God himself remembers his people.

J. Cornelis de Vos argues that the community of believers in 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 constitutes a temple on a conceptual level. Through holiness, which is morally performed and conditioned, God can be near to this community of believers. By means of intertextual analysis of Leviticus 26 and Ezekiel 37 de Vos further claims that the community of believers not only constitutes a "temple" but also constitutes a "land." "This 'land' is or becomes holy by the community keeping itself separate morally for God and, at the same time, by the presence of God amidst this social-spatial 'temple' and 'land'" (see below p. 148).

Due to scholarly history, the expression "Bible" in "rewritten Bible" traditionally refers to the texts Christians call "the Old Testament." However, only convention prevents scholars to use it for New Testament material. Lukas Bormann applies the approach to investigate how the anonymous writer of Colossians has "rewritten" Paul, as well as the Old Testament, esp. Ezek 45:17 and Hos 2:13 LXX. Paul himself could not accept that Christians should "observe days" (Gal 4:11) and was also cautious with contact with angels (2 Cor 11:14; Gal 1:8). Colossians, however, does not reject religious festivals or the worship of angels, but criticises people judging fellow Christians for these practices. Doing so, the author sought continuity with Old Testament traditions, especially with Ezekiel and Hosea.

Christians were early starters in appreciating places linked with their holy history. Anni Maria Laato shows in her contribution how holy tourism attracted Christians in the late fourth century—and also how it divided opinions. While some theologians encouraged people to visit the holy places in Palestine, others declared pilgrimages worthless. Biblical arguments were needed, and scriptures were used creatively. Fortunately, we happen to have a letter in which two Roman ladies and close friends of

Jerome, Paula and Eustochium, write to their female friend, Marcella. Paula and Eustochium had joined Jerome and made a tour on holy places, and full of enthusiasm wrote to their friend, who had rejected the pilgrimage for theological reasons. Laato presents which places were mentioned in the letter and how the ladies used the scriptures to support their view. The letter, transmitted among Jerome's epistles, contains several examples of how the ladies had changed and reinterpreted biblical passages, combined texts from different periods, and added new material to support their view. All this was meant to show Marcella that, in contrast to the view of their opponents, holiness had not left Jerusalem.

In an interesting epilogue to this volume Martin Tamcke presents how Paul Rohrbach, a liberal protestant theologian followed the German emperor Wilhelm II to the Holy Land. Rohrbach, born in 1869 in Dorpat (Tartu), had grown up in a strong, traditional pietistic environment. During his theological studies he had abandoned his former views and became a vehement supporter of the liberal theology of his teacher Adolf von Harnack. When a German publisher paid for the travel of Rohrbach and his newly married wife to get a fresh view of the Holy Land, Rohrbach used the situation to support this liberal theology and his fellow ministers who were unwilling to use, for example, the Apostolic Creed in their services and who were struggling with their religious authorities in Germany. Beautiful descriptions of Bethlehem, Nazareth and others were skilfully used to strengthen the call to follow Jesus' original religion, as Rohrbach understood it.