

## FROM 4QREWORKED PENTATEUCH TO 4QPENTATEUCH (?)

Emanuel Tov

### 1. BACKGROUND

The name “4QReworked Pentateuch” was conceived in 1992 when I was working on this composition at the Annenberg Institute for Advanced Studies, at first alone, and later together with Sidnie White Crawford.<sup>1</sup> The texts were assigned to me in the 1980s by John Strugnell, who had identified the manuscripts and had done some work on them. Beyond Strugnell’s initial philological work on these texts, we are indebted to him for assembling the fragments that he assigned to the four manuscripts of this nonbiblical composition (4Q364–367) from among the many thousands, identified by their handwriting and content. This was not an easy task because of the great similarity of the assumed text of this nonbiblical composition to the canonical books of the Torah. As a result, doubts remained as to whether specific fragments assigned to 4QRP indeed belonged to that composition, or were part of a regular biblical manuscript. In addition, the following six fragments or groups of fragments, although given different names, could have been part of 4QRP: 2QExod<sup>b</sup> (containing several exegetical additions), 4QExod<sup>d</sup> (omitting the narrative section of 13:17–22 and all of chapter 14), 6QDeut<sup>?</sup> (possibly to be named 6QparaDeut because of its unclear character), 4QDeut<sup>k2</sup> (containing a mixture of chapters) and 11QT<sup>b</sup> 11:21–24 (previously described as 11QDeut [Deut 13:7–11] by Johannes van der Ploeg, but identified as part of 11QT<sup>b</sup> by Adam van der Woude and Florentino García Martínez).<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The texts were published as: E. Tov and S. White, “363–367: 4QReworked Pentateuch<sup>b-c</sup> and 365a: 4QTemple?” in *Qumran Cave 4.VIII, Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (H. Attridge et al.; DJD 13; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 187–351, 459–63 and pl. XIII–XXXVI.

<sup>2</sup> For details, see my study “4QReworked Pentateuch: A Synopsis of Its Contents,” *RevQ* 16 (1995): 647–53 (649).

At that early stage, when Strugnell was still collecting the fragments, he named this composition “4QPentateuchal Paraphrase.” Its genre was considered as related to 4Q158, published in *DJD* 5 (1968) by John Allegro as “4QBiblical Paraphrase.”<sup>3</sup>

The analysis of the so-called “4QPentateuchal Paraphrase” was determined by that of 4Q158 even though a genetic connection between the two had not been recognized. 4Q158 was published by Allegro in his characteristic nonchalant system, as with all other texts in *DJD* 5. The number of textual notes was absolutely minimal, and there was no introduction explaining the literary genre of 4Q158, although it was novel at the time of its publication. Further, the transcription included many wrong details; the line numbering is incorrect in fragments 10–12, and the close connection between 4Q158 and the Samaritan Pentateuch (SP) was not recognized. In due course, Strugnell corrected many of Allegro’s mistakes in his book-length review of *DJD* 5.<sup>4</sup>

It is important to remember the history of the analysis of these texts and the genre names given to them. Since 4Q158 had been published as “4QBiblical Paraphrase,” Strugnell used the same name for 4Q364–367, which he presumed to belong to the same genre. Its first name therefore was “4QPentateuchal Paraphrase” (4QPP), a name we inherited from Strugnell. However, we realized that the term “paraphrase” was not appropriate for 4QPP, since a paraphrase usually involves a more extensive type of editing than that presumably performed by the author of this composition. After all, the manuscripts included long stretches of text unaltered by the author of 4QPP. Looking for a more general term that reflected the nature of these manuscripts, we opted for 4QReworked Pentateuch. The thought behind this change was that “reworking” is more general than “paraphrase” and would allow for long stretches of unaltered text. The first identity crisis of 4Q364–367 thus was its name change from 4QPP to 4QRP. In our conception, 4QRP included 4Q158, which I had identified as belonging to the same composition as 4Q364–367.<sup>5</sup>

The second identity crisis was to come much later. In the meantime, when naming the composition 4QPP or renaming it as 4QRP, we were

<sup>3</sup> J.M. Allegro, “158: Biblical Paraphrase: Genesis, Exodus,” in *Qumrân Cave 4.I* (J.M. Allegro; *DJD* 5; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 1–6.

<sup>4</sup> J. Strugnell, “Notes en marge du Volume V des ‘Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan,’” *RevQ* 7/26 (1970): 163–276 (168–75).

<sup>5</sup> See my analysis in Tov and White, *DJD* 13:189–91.

much influenced by Strugnell. At the same time, I had a strong internal conviction that 4QRP could not represent a biblical text. Nevertheless, I did not know exactly what was the genre of this composition, described as a reworked Bible composition<sup>6</sup> similar to 11QT<sup>a</sup> 51–66. In my introduction to 4QRP, I described its character as follows:

The five manuscripts of 4QRP share important characteristics. These five groups of fragments should therefore be seen as copies of the same composition, rather than, in more general terms, of the same literary genre. This composition contained a running text of the Pentateuch interspersed with exegetical additions and omissions. The greater part of the preserved fragments follows the biblical text closely, but many small exegetical elements are added, while other elements are omitted, or, in other cases, their sequence altered. The exegetical character of this composition is especially evident from several exegetical additions comprising half a line, one line, two lines, and even seven or eight lines. The most outstanding examples of this technique are the expanded Song of Miriam in 4Q365 6a ii and c and possibly also frg. 14 of 4Q158.<sup>7</sup>

A third fragment, namely 4QRP<sup>c</sup> (4Q365) 23, deviates in a major way from the other biblical texts. The first four lines of this fragment quote the last two verses of the instructions for the *Sukkot* festival in Lev 23:42–43, as well as a summarizing verse (23:44), and Lev 24:1–2. However, in frg. 23 the beginning of Lev 24 now serves as the introduction to a list of additional laws concerning offerings. These laws are based on material found either in the Bible or elsewhere, such as the

<sup>6</sup> For studies on this literary genre, see G.J. Brooke, “Rewritten Bible,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 2:777–81; idem, “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* (ed. E.D. Herbert and E. Tov; London: British Library, 2002), 31–40; D.D. Swanson, “How Scriptural is Re-Written Bible?” *RevQ* 21/83 (2004): 407–27; M. Segal, “Between Bible and Rewritten Bible,” in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. M. Henze; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005), 10–29; M.J. Bernstein, “‘Rewritten Bible’: A Generic Category Which Has Outlived its Usefulness?” *Textus* 22 (2005): 169–96. See also E. Tov, “Biblical Texts as Reworked in Some Qumran Manuscripts with Special Attention to 4QRP and 4QParaGen-Exod,” in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam; Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 111–34; D.J. Harrington, S.J., “Palestinian Adaptations of Biblical Narratives and Prophecies,” in *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpretations* (ed. R.A. Kraft and G.W.E. Nickelsburg; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1986), 242–47.

<sup>7</sup> Tov and White, *DJD* 13:191. Frg. 14 of 4Q158 provides an unknown exegetical addition or commentary mentioning “Egypt,” “I shall redeem them,” “the midst of the sea in the depths.” This fragment, written in the same hand as the remainder of 4Q158, reflects a rather long addition, relating to the story of Exodus.

Festival of Fresh Oil (4Q365 23 9). Lines 10 and 11 probably refer to the Wood Festival, also known from Neh 10:35, 13:31 and 11QT<sup>a</sup>.<sup>8</sup>

4QRP is also characterized by several deviations from the text sequence of MT and all other texts.<sup>9</sup> Thus, the *Sukkot* laws of Num 29:32–30:1 and Deut 16:13–14 were combined in 4QRP<sup>b</sup> (4Q364) 23a–b i. In this case, one does not know where this fragment was placed in 4QRP, in Numbers or Deuteronomy.

The extensive additions in the Song of Miriam in 4QRP<sup>c</sup> 6a ii and c, in the additional laws concerning offerings (4Q365 23), and in frg. 14 of 4QRP<sup>a</sup> (4Q158) differed so much from the biblical manuscripts I knew that I could not imagine that 4QRP contained a biblical manuscript. Obviously, determining the relation between the new text 4QRP and the scriptural manuscripts depends on one's definition of what is a Scripture text. The more extensive one's definition of the biblical texts, for example when including the Qumran Psalter texts and excerpted texts, the greater the chances that one would be inclined to include 4QRP among the biblical texts. However, my own definition of the biblical texts was and is not so encompassing as to include these texts. As a result, we did not consider 4QRP a biblical text. The extended Song of Miriam adds an exegetical dimension to the text that was not equaled in any biblical text I could think of. The seven lines of added text recreated the Song of Miriam that in the canonical text consists of only one verse. The new creation is based on that verse and on the wording of the Song of Moses. The list of biblical and extrabiblical festivals in 4QRP<sup>c</sup> 23 involves a similar exegetical dimension. True, such exegetical additions are found also in the Targumim, but they are not biblical manuscripts.

I did not recognize any parallel to this expanded Song in the LXX of other books because, in my view at the time, most major LXX deviations from MT reflect elements *anterior* to MT, such as the LXX texts of Samuel, Jeremiah, Ezekiel; hence, they did not parallel the Song of Miriam, since that Song is clearly secondary. I say this as a justification for my view, since in my textual outlook of the 1990s there was no room for major post-MT exegetical expansions among the authori-

<sup>8</sup> For both festivals, see Tov and White, *DJD* 13:295.

<sup>9</sup> In *DJD* 13:191, I noted: "The sequence of the individual elements of 4QRP cannot be reconstructed. In one instance, a fragment juxtaposing a section from Numbers and Deuteronomy (4Q364 23a–b i: Num 20:17–18; Deut 2:8–14) probably derives from the rewritten text of Deuteronomy, since a similar sequence is found in SP."

tative Scripture texts in the LXX. I also did not consider the many SP additions to be valid parallels to the Song of Miriam since the SP does not add any *new* material to the proto-MT text. It only repeats sections in an immediate or remote context.<sup>10</sup> By the same token, I did not know of any authoritative Hebrew biblical manuscript from Qumran or elsewhere that included such large exegetical additions. This statement is subjective, since the Psalms scrolls, especially 11QPs<sup>a</sup>, would have provided a parallel to a biblical scroll 4QRP, but I do not consider these Psalms scrolls to be Scripture texts. The modern names of these scrolls are misleading, since in my view these are liturgical scrolls that alter authoritative Scripture texts.<sup>11</sup> Like 4QRP, the Psalms scrolls reflect major sequence deviations from MT. They also contain a major exegetical addition, if we characterize the list of David's compositions in 11QPs<sup>a</sup> 27 in such a way, but otherwise they are not comparable to 4QRP. At the time, we did not compare 4QRP with the greatly deviating Canticles scrolls 4QCant<sup>a,b</sup> since they had not yet been published. But even had we known them, we would not have considered them valid parallels for 4QRP as Scripture texts, since we consider these Canticles scrolls to be abbreviated texts, and hence not regular Scripture texts.<sup>12</sup>

This brief apologetic explanation should explain why in the 1990s I did not consider 4QRP a Bible text, the main reason being that in my textual *Weltanschauung* there was no room for Scripture texts that contained such major deviations from MT as those in 4QRP.

4Q364–367 thus entered the world as a nonbiblical text and although the majority of its components were scriptural, it was not included in lists of biblical manuscripts such as my list in the introduction volume

<sup>10</sup> See my study "Rewritten Bible Compositions and Biblical Manuscripts, with Special Attention to the Samaritan Pentateuch," *DSD* 5 (1998): 334–54.

<sup>11</sup> This view is based on S. Talmon, "Pisqah Be'emša' Pasuq and 11QPs<sup>a</sup>," *Textus* 5 (1966): 11–21; M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, "The Psalms Scroll (11QPs<sup>a</sup>): A Problem of Canon and Text," *Textus* 5 (1966): 22–33; M. Haran, "11QPs<sup>a</sup> and the Canonical Book of Psalms," in *Minhah le-Nahum: Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honour of His 70th Birthday* (ed. M.Z. Brettler and M.A. Fishbane; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 193–201. A different view is presented by P.W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms* (Leiden: Brill, 1997).

<sup>12</sup> For a different view, see E. Ulrich, "The Qumran Biblical Scrolls: The Scriptures of Late Second Temple Judaism," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* (ed. T.H. Lim et al.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 67–87 (78).

to *DJD*.<sup>13</sup> Paradoxically, that list of Scripture manuscripts numbering 200–201 items thus included many texts we did *not* consider Scripture but which carried biblical names (most of the thirty-six Psalms scrolls, 4QCant<sup>a,b</sup> and several additional texts), while it excluded 4QRP (4Q158, 4Q364–367), since they were published as nonbiblical scrolls. Anthologies of Qumran texts behaved in various ways. The *Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*<sup>14</sup> and its electronic revision in *DSSEL*,<sup>15</sup> both listing only nonbiblical texts, contained the complete text of 4QRP. The Qumran concordance likewise covered all these texts.<sup>16</sup> On the other hand, the *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*<sup>17</sup> and the translation of Wise, Abegg and Cook<sup>18</sup> include a mere selection of the exegetical additions to the MT texts. The only culprit of this inconsistency is the *DJD* edition of Tov and White.

The main focus of our present study is the second identity crisis of 4QRP. Six years after its publication, 4QRP was described as a biblical text by two scholars, who were not influenced by Strugnell as we were, and who also knew more parallel texts than we did in 1993 when the volume went to the press. Eugene Ulrich and Michael Segal independently claimed in 2000 that some or all of the 4QRP manuscripts contain regular Scripture. Without any specific argument relating to 4QRP, Ulrich stated: “It is arguable that the so-called ‘4QRP’ (4Q364–367 plus 4Q158) is mislabelled and should be seen as simply another edition of the Pentateuch. There is still insufficient analysis to determine whether it should be considered an alternate edition of

<sup>13</sup> E. Tov in *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (E. Tov et al.; *DJD* 39; Oxford: Clarendon, 2002), 165–83.

<sup>14</sup> D.W. Parry and E. Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader, Parts 1–6* (Leiden: Brill, 2004–2005).

<sup>15</sup> *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library*, Brigham Young University, Revised Edition 2006, part of the Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library of E.J. Brill Publishers (ed. E. Tov; Leiden: Brill, 2006) <All the texts and images of the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls with morphological analysis and search programs>.

<sup>16</sup> M.G. Abegg, Jr., with J.E. Bowley and E.M. Cook, in consultation with E. Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance, Volume I: The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

<sup>17</sup> F. Garcia Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 2000).

<sup>18</sup> M.O. Wise, M.G. Abegg, and E.M. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2005). This edition contains 4Q158 (inappropriately named “A Reworking of Genesis and Exodus”) as well as a few selections from 4Q364–367 named “An Annotated Law of Moses.”

the Pentateuch or a post-Pentateuchal para-Scriptural work.”<sup>19</sup> In general terms, Ulrich suggested that Scripture texts circulated in many shapes, all of them authoritative (SP, LXX, paleo-Hebrew and other scrolls from Qumran, 4QRP, the large Isaiah scroll, some abbreviated texts, etc.). In the same year, Segal stated: “If these scrolls are classified as parabiblical texts, as they were by the editors, it is difficult to understand why the scribe felt the need to copy the text of the entire Pentateuch.”<sup>20</sup> Segal makes this claim for 4Q364–365, which he named 4QPentateuch and for 4Q367, which he named “4QLeviticus,” in his view being an excerpted Leviticus text.<sup>21</sup>

I changed my own views on 4QRP in 2005, not because of the claims by Ulrich and Segal, but in the wake of my analysis of the LXX versions of 1 Kings (3 Kingdoms), Esther, and Daniel (especially Dan 4–6), unrelated to 4QRP.<sup>22</sup> I suggested that the *Vorlagen* of these three LXX books reflect a stage subsequent to that in MT. All three books were based on underlying Semitic texts that rewrote texts resembling MT, adding and changing major sections in these books. We also found several characteristic features in these three LXX compositions that are shared with rewritten Bible compositions from Qumran. Upon

<sup>19</sup> Ulrich, “The Qumran Biblical Scrolls,” 76. Elsewhere, Ulrich named this text “yet another variant literary edition of the Pentateuch, parallel to the traditional MT.” See “The Qumran Scrolls and the Biblical Text,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery, 1947–1997* (ed. L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J.C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 51–59 (57). Lange likewise asserted (without arguments) that 4QRP was “regarded as the word of God,” see A. Lange, “The Status of the Biblical Text in the Qumran Corpus and the Canonical Process,” in *The Bible as Book* (ed. Herbert and Tov), 21–30 (27). At the end of his very detailed and insightful analysis, Falk remains undecided: “Whether 4QRP was intended to be read as a new edition of Mosaic Torah, or as some sort of interpretative account alongside Scripture is perhaps impossible to answer with confidence.” See D.K. Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: T&T Clark, 2007), 107–19 (119).

<sup>20</sup> M. Segal, “4QReworked Pentateuch or 4QPentateuch?” in *Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years* (ed. Schiffman, Tov, and VanderKam), 391–99 (394).

<sup>21</sup> Segal, “4QReworked Pentateuch,” 395, 399.

<sup>22</sup> The papers themselves were published later: “Three Strange Books of the LXX: 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions from Qumran and Elsewhere,” in *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten* (ed. M. Karrer and W. Kraus; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 369–93; “The Many Forms of Hebrew Scripture: Reflections in Light of the LXX and 4QReworked Pentateuch,” in *From Qumran to Aleppo: A Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scriptures in Honor of his 65th Birthday* (ed. A. Lange, M. Weigold, and J. Zsengellér; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009), 11–28.

discovering these features, I realized that they have implications for our understanding of the LXX, several Qumran scrolls, and canonical conceptions in general. The three books, which I named “Three strange books,” include major secondary features, and in spite of these features the new texts were considered authoritative Scripture texts. After all, the Greek canon includes 3 Kingdoms, Esther, and Daniel, which in my view constitute rewritten versions of earlier compositions similar to those now included in MT. The three rewritten books were considered authoritative in their Semitic and Greek forms, although by different communities. SP, likewise a rewritten version of MT, as well as its pre-Samaritan forerunners, enjoyed similar authority. Rewritten versions, as well as the earlier ones on which they were based (for example, the MT of 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel), were considered equally authoritative, by different communities and in different periods. In that study, I suggested that some of the rewritten Bible compositions from Qumran may likewise have enjoyed an authoritative status. We do not know if or how well these compositions were accepted at Qumran or elsewhere, but it is probable that at least some of the “noncanonical” books were accepted as authoritative by that community.

Keeping in mind that the LXX includes exponents of major rewriting that have become authoritative Scripture, we should thus be open to the possibility that 4QRP is a regular Scripture text that carried authority equal to that of the Hebrew texts underlying the LXX. While at a previous stage I did not recognize any parallels for the large exegetical additions, omissions, and changes of 4QRP, we have now found perfect parallels for that Qumran composition. This logic urged me, against my own expectations, to change my mind regarding 4QRP. I now consider 4QRP a Scripture text, or more precisely, a group of Scripture texts. Not everyone will accept this view, so that we should avoid introducing a new name such as 4QPentateuch. Indeed, in a recent paper, Moshe Bernstein does not go as far as naming these texts Scripture, although he entertains the possibility that 4Q364 is a biblical text.<sup>23</sup> His main argument is that “its [4QRP’s] radically free and

<sup>23</sup> M.J. Bernstein, “What Has Happened to the Laws? The Treatment of Legal Material in 4QReworked Pentateuch,” *DSD* 15 (2008): 24–49 (48): “Are the 4QRP manuscripts biblical? My response after all this is ‘which ones?’ As I noted above, 4Q364 might very well be, but regarding the others I suggest ‘probably not.’”

highly idiosyncratic handling of legal material must be acknowledged to be possible in a pentateuchal manuscript.<sup>24</sup>

Changing names in published Qumran texts is never a good idea, and therefore we should hold on to the name 4QRP. By the same token, we have to live with the name *11Q Temple* (better: *11Q Temple<sup>a</sup>*), suggested by Yigael Yadin, rather than the possibly better name *11Q Torah*, suggested by Ben Zion Wacholder.<sup>25</sup> In the case of 4QRP, we should do away with the term “Reworked,” as the five manuscripts of 4QRP probably are simply five Torah manuscripts. By changing the name *4QPentateuchal Paraphrase* to *4QReworked Pentateuch* and then to *4QPentateuch*,<sup>26</sup> although we do not suggest the actual use of this name, we move on to the third stage of its existence. We now turn to the question of whether these five manuscripts may indeed be considered regular Torah manuscripts.

Since we are no longer bound by the assumption that 4QRP was a nonbiblical *composition*, we should now regard these manuscripts as five separate Scripture *manuscripts* (4Q158, 4Q364–367), related or not.<sup>27</sup> When doing so, we need not refer to the question whether 4Q158 belongs to the same group as 4Q364–367<sup>28</sup> since all the texts

<sup>24</sup> Bernstein, “The Treatment of Legal Material in 4QReworked Pentateuch,” 33.

<sup>25</sup> B.Z. Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness* (Cincinnati, Conn.: Hebrew Union College Press, 1983); idem, “The Ancient Judaeo-Aramaic Literature (500–164 BCE): A Classification of Pre-Qumranic Texts,” in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (ed. L.H. Schiffman; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990) 257–81 (273–74).

<sup>26</sup> This name was suggested by Segal, “4QReworked Pentateuch,” 398.

<sup>27</sup> If these manuscripts are taken as exponents of a single composition, we lack evidence for Gen 1–20, Lev 1–10, Num 18–26, and Deut 21–34. In the case of Genesis, two fragments may present material from these chapters: (1) In his publication of 4QGen<sup>b</sup>, frg. 5, J. Davila quotes Strugnell who suggests that this fragment actually belongs to 4Q158, and hence to 4QRP. This assumption is based on paleographical considerations, and since the fragment is very small, its provenience cannot be established easily. The text of this fragment deviates slightly from MT. See J.R. Davila in *Qumran Cave 4.VII: Genesis to Numbers* (E. Ulrich et al.; DJD 12; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 75–78 (75); (2) Davila suggests that 4Q8b (Gen 12:4–5), written in the same handwriting as the other fragments of 4QGen<sup>b</sup>, possibly belongs to 4QRP or another rewritten text of Genesis. The text of this small fragment deviates slightly from MT. See Davila, *DJD* 12:62.

<sup>28</sup> Several scholars have suggested that 4Q158 needs to be separated from 4Q364–7: M. Segal, “Biblical Exegesis in 4Q158: Techniques and Genre,” *Textus* 19 (1997): 45–62; M.J. Bernstein in his review of *DJD* 12 in *DSD* 4 (1997): 102–22 (103–4); G.J. Brooke, “4Q158: Reworked Pentateuch<sup>a</sup> or Reworked Pentateuch A?” *DSD* 8 (2001): 219–41.

now reflect individual manuscripts. If these fragments are taken as individual manuscripts, the five manuscripts contain fragments of the following chapters:<sup>29</sup>

- 4QRP<sup>a</sup> (4Q158): Gen 32 and Exod 19–24, 30;  
 4QRP<sup>b</sup> (4Q364): Gen 2, 25–48, Exod, 19–26, Num 14 and 33, and Deut 1–14, but not Leviticus;  
 4QRP<sup>c</sup> (4Q365): Gen 21, Exod 8–39, Lev 11–26, Num 1–36, and Deut 2, 19;  
 4QRP<sup>d</sup> (4Q366): Exod 21–22, Num 29, and Deut 14, 16;  
 4QRP<sup>e</sup> (4Q367): Lev 11–27.<sup>30</sup>

These manuscripts possibly contained merely some of the Torah books, as suggested by Segal,<sup>31</sup> while others may have contained the complete Torah. Thus, 4QRP<sup>c</sup> contains fragments of all five books, 4QRP<sup>b</sup> lacks only Leviticus, 4QRP<sup>d</sup> lacks Genesis and Leviticus, while 4QRP<sup>a</sup> contains only Genesis and Exodus, and 4QRP<sup>e</sup> contains only Leviticus. The other Torah scrolls from the Judean Desert provide samples of both single-book manuscripts and combinations of two or three Torah books,<sup>32</sup> and therefore the presumed coverage of some of our five manuscripts is wider.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>29</sup> For details, see Tov, “4QReworked Pentateuch: A Synopsis.”

<sup>30</sup> It is not impossible that 4Q367 belongs to the same scroll as 4Q364, since 4Q367 contains only Leviticus, while no fragment of that book has been preserved in 4Q364. If that is so, the two groups of fragments would have had to have been produced by different scribes.

<sup>31</sup> Segal, “4QReworked Pentateuch,” 393–98 suggested that 4QRP<sup>a</sup> does not belong to the same unit as 4QRP<sup>b–e</sup> and that 4QRP<sup>e</sup> contained merely a single biblical book, Leviticus.

<sup>32</sup> For details, see E. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 75.

<sup>33</sup> The inclusion of more than one biblical book in a scroll is evidenced for four, five, or six Torah scrolls: 4QGen-Exod<sup>a</sup> (36 lines; evidence unclear), 4QpaleoGen-Exod<sup>l</sup> (55–60 lines), 4QExod<sup>b</sup> (= 4Q[Gen-]Exod<sup>b</sup>; ca. 50 lines), and possibly also 4QExod-Lev<sup>f</sup> (ca. 60 lines), 4QLev-Num<sup>a</sup> (43 lines), and Mur 1 (ca. 60 lines), the last possibly containing Genesis, Exodus, and Numbers (see *DJD* 2:75–78). In all these cases, the spaces between the two books have been preserved together with some letters or words of the adjacent book, but in no instance has the full evidence been preserved. The large column size of several of these scrolls confirms the assumption that they indeed contained two or more books, since a large number of lines per column usually imply that the scroll was long. On the basis of the large parameters of these scrolls, it may be assumed that other Torah scrolls likewise contained two or more books: 4QGen<sup>e</sup> (ca. 50 lines), 4QExod<sup>c</sup> (ca. 43), MasDeut (42), SdeirGen (ca. 40), 4QGen<sup>b</sup> (40).

## 2. TEXTUAL AND EXEGETICAL NATURE

The textual background of the five manuscripts differs.<sup>34</sup> Beyond the small textual differences between the five Qumran manuscripts and the other textual witnesses, we note that two of the manuscripts of 4QRP are close to the *sp* (4QRP<sup>a</sup>, 4QRP<sup>b</sup>), while the other three are not. These two texts and 4QRP<sup>c</sup> are written in the special Qumran scribal practice, while 4Q366 and 4Q367 are not.<sup>35</sup>

4QRP<sup>a</sup>, more than the other 4QRP texts, reflects the major editorial features of *sp* in frgs. 6–8 as well as small details of *sp* in all fragments. Thus frg. 6 includes the divine command (Deut 18:18–22) to establish a prophet like Moses. Likewise, 4Q158 7–8, like *sp*,<sup>36</sup> interweaves sections from the parallel account in Deut 5:28–31 into the description of the Mount Sinai theophany in Exodus 20. The Qumran text and *sp* thus follow the same sequence of the verses. More precisely, *sp* was based on 4QRP<sup>a</sup> or a similar pre-Samaritan text.

4QRP<sup>b</sup>, like 4QRP<sup>a</sup>, is close to *sp*.<sup>37</sup> This closeness is shown in two editorial additions that are characteristic of *sp* (Gen 30:26 and Deut 2:8), and in many small details. One of these small details is especially noteworthy, viz., 4Q364 11 2 Binyamim consistently represented thus in this way in *sp* (MT: Binyamin).

4QRP<sup>c</sup> is not as close to *sp* as was thought previously<sup>38</sup> since it does not reflect the editorial manipulations of *sp*.<sup>39</sup>

What are the implications of the fact that two of the 4QRP manuscripts reflect the *sp*? As long as 4QRP was considered a nonbiblical

<sup>34</sup> For a detailed analysis, see my studies “The Textual Status of 4Q364–367 (4QPP),” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. Treballe Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 1.43–82; “Biblical Texts as Reworked in Some Qumran Manuscripts with Special Attention to 4QRP and 4QParaGen-Exod,” in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant* (ed. Ulrich and VanderKam), 111–34.

<sup>35</sup> See Tov, *Scribal Practices*, Appendix 1 and passim. R.S. Nam, “How to Rewrite Torah: The Case for Proto-Sectarian Ideology in the *Reworked Pentateuch* (4QRP),” *RevQ* 23/90 (2007): 153–63 recognizes in 4QRP traces of Qumran sectarian ideology, but in my view the proofs are not convincing.

<sup>36</sup> The two are not identical. See E. Tov, “The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts,” *JSOT* 31 (1985): 3–29.

<sup>37</sup> See Tov and White, *DJD* 13:192–93.

<sup>38</sup> Tov and White, *DJD* 13:194.

<sup>39</sup> Thus A. Kim, “The Textual Alignment of the Tabernacle Sections of 4Q365 (Fragments 8a–b, 9a–b i, 9b ii, 12a i, 12b iii),” *Textus* 21 (2002): 45–69. Kim studied only some of the sections of this manuscript, but her conclusions seem to be valid.

text, we could say that it was based on a pre-Samaritan text in the same way that other nonbiblical texts were based on that text in part or in full, such as *4QTestimonia* (4Q175) in major details and *Jubilees* in minor details. Since the five manuscripts of 4QRP are now considered Scripture texts, the agreements of two manuscripts with *SP* in minor and major details may be problematic since the nature of 4QRP differs completely from that of *SP*. *SP* added many verses and sections to its underlying text, always by repeating Scripture verses occurring elsewhere. It also inserted contextual changes, almost always based on the context. On the other hand, the five manuscripts of 4QRP added details reflecting exegetical activity not instigated by the context. These two different tendencies cannot be reconciled, but nevertheless a solution is in sight. The five manuscripts of 4QRP are exegetical, and as such, they are based on different earlier sources. In this case, these earlier sources were pre-Samaritan texts.

The feature that characterizes all five manuscripts is their common *exegetical* character. Because of this feature, the texts were bundled together since there are no significant overlaps between the manuscripts.<sup>40</sup> Some of the major exegetical features (disregarding possible textual variations) are:

*4QRP<sup>a</sup>*. See Segal's detailed analysis.<sup>41</sup>

*4QRP<sup>b</sup>*. Before the Scripture text of 3 ii 7–8 (Gen 28:6), 4QRP added at least six lines of text not known from other sources. This exegetical addition expanding the biblical story seems to contain material relating to Rebecca's address to the departing Jacob and Isaac's consolation of her.

In 4Q364 14 1–2, at least two words from Exod 19:17 appear before Exod 24:12 instead of the text of v. 11 LXX, *SP*, *MT*. The most likely explanation for the evidence is that the fragment does not present a sequence of Exod 19:17 and 24:12, but constitutes a freely rewritten text using elements of 19:17 before 24:12.

The two lines of additional text after Exod 24:18 (4Q364 15 3–4) may have described what God showed Moses during the forty days and forty nights, prior to his speech (Exod 25) at the end of that period.

<sup>40</sup> See Tov and White, *DJD* 13:188.

<sup>41</sup> Segal, "Biblical Exegesis."

Further exegetical additions and changes appear in 4Q364 3 ii, 5b ii.<sup>42</sup>

4QRP<sup>c</sup>. 6a ii and 6c contains the largest preserved addition in 4QRP reflecting a hitherto unknown poetical composition (Song of Miriam), preserved in part, following the Song at the Sea (Song of Moses) in Exod 15.<sup>43</sup>

A similar case of juxtaposing laws dealing with the same topic pertains to the narrative and laws regarding the daughters of Zelophehad. 4Q365 36 (Num 27:11, 36:1–2) combines these two texts referring to the daughters of Zelophehad. 4QNum<sup>b</sup> likewise fused Num 36:1–2, though in a different way, with the contents of Num 27.

The first three lines of 4Q365 28 present Num 4:47–49, the last verses of the chapter, pertaining to the census of the Levites, followed by a blank line and the first verse of Num 7 (“On the day when Moses had finished setting up the Tabernacle”). The miscellaneous laws that appear between these sections in MT (concerning lepers, adultery, etc. in Num 5 and Nazirites in Num 6) have been left out in this context, probably due to their irrelevance to the topic, which may be defined as the temple service.

4QRP<sup>d</sup>. The different sequence of the *Sukkot* laws is mentioned above in the first section. Likewise, 4Q366 2 (Lev 24:20–22 [?], 25:39–43) adduces the text of Lev 25:39–43, referring to the freeing of slaves, immediately after the end of the *lex talionis* (Lev 24:20–22 is preserved).

4QRP<sup>e</sup>. In 4Q367 2, several chapters of Leviticus are omitted between Lev 15:14–15 and 19:1–4, 9–15. The identification of the text adduced in these fragments is not without problems and, furthermore, the internal sequence of the components of the text remains difficult to understand. The missing chapters of Leviticus were not in fact omitted but adduced elsewhere, since Lev 18:25–29 occurs in 4Q367 22.

### 3. AUTHORITATIVE TEXTS?

When we still considered 4QRP to be a rewritten Bible composition we said that we had little information regarding its possibly authoritative status. White Crawford struggled with this issue in 2000, after our

<sup>42</sup> For a discussion, see Segal, “4QReworked Pentateuch,” 393–94.

<sup>43</sup> See G.J. Brooke, “The Long-Lost Song of Miriam,” *BAR* 20/3 (1994): 62–65.

*DJD* publication.<sup>44</sup> While discussing the “authoritative status” of this composition, she drew attention to the possibility that *Jubilees* quotes from 4QRP<sup>b</sup> 3, that 11QT<sup>a</sup> quotes from 4QRP<sup>c</sup> 23 and that these quotations may imply the authoritative status of 4QRP. However, at the end she leaves the question open,<sup>45</sup> although she leans towards the view that 4QRP was a “commentary.”<sup>46</sup>

There is no new evidence bearing on 4QRP’s status as an authoritative Torah version at Qumran beyond what was known ten or twenty years ago. However, if we conceive of the five 4QRP manuscripts as separate Scripture texts, the questions asked are somewhat different. Were these manuscripts considered authoritative<sup>47</sup> in spite of their exegetical freedom compared with an earlier text like MT? If White Crawford is correct in assuming that *Jubilees* and 11QT<sup>a</sup> quote from 4QRP<sup>b,c</sup>, this may indeed be a reason for assuming the latter’s authoritative status. However, the data do not corroborate such an assumption; it is more likely that *Jubilees*, 11QT<sup>a</sup> and 4QRP<sup>b,c</sup> reflect a common exegetical tradition.<sup>48</sup> But if we have no stable arguments for assuming the authoritative status of the Scripture manuscripts previously named 4QRP, it does not preclude the possibility that these five manuscripts nevertheless had such a status. In that case, the doubts regarding the five manuscripts are shared with the other biblical Qumran manuscripts. Phrased positively, we believe that all the Qumran Scripture manuscripts had an authoritative status. When making such a statement, we move the problem one stage back, since we now have

<sup>44</sup> S. White Crawford, “4QReworked Pentateuch,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Schiffman and VanderKam), 2:775–77 (777); eadem, “The Rewritten Bible at Qumran,” in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls, Volume One: Scripture and the Scrolls* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2006), 1:131–47 (142–44).

<sup>45</sup> White Crawford, “4QReworked Pentateuch,” 777: “The Reworked Pentateuch may have been accepted by the inhabitants at Qumran as another version of the authoritative Torah or it may have been considered a rewritten version that did not carry the same authority. The question remains unanswered.”

<sup>46</sup> S. White Crawford, “The ‘Rewritten’ Bible at Qumran: A Look at Three Texts,” *ErIsr* 26 (1999): 1–8\* (4\*): “4QRP was perceived not as a biblical text, but as a commentary, an inner-biblical commentary on the text of the Torah.”

<sup>47</sup> When using this term, we refer to the status of a text as inspired Scripture with the implication that its contents were considered binding for the community that espoused that text.

<sup>48</sup> The evidence is not compelling. 4QRP<sup>b</sup> 3 ii 2 shares an expression with *Jub.* 27:17: “and we see him in peace.” 4QRP<sup>c</sup> 23 10–11 shares the tribal order with 11QT<sup>a</sup> 24; this order is not found elsewhere in Jewish literature.

to ask ourselves: “What is a Scripture manuscript?” We believe that the great majority of the 200 manuscripts listed as “biblical” (Scripture) in *DJD* 39 are indeed biblical. Much depends on each scholar’s individual beliefs; I myself exclude from this list the Qumran Psalter texts, which I consider liturgical, as well as excerpted texts such as 4QCant<sup>a,b</sup>. There is no need to address this issue in this study, since the individual manuscripts of 4QRP belong to a group different from these problematical texts, and in a way they are closer to the other manuscripts that we name proto-MT, SP-like, LXX-like, and independent. The default for all these manuscripts is that they were authoritative Scripture manuscripts. There are few criteria for assuming the authoritative status of Qumran Scripture manuscripts. Among the few criteria for the authoritative status of a Judean Desert scroll, we mention the following three:

1. A Judean Desert scroll forms part of a manuscript tradition or family that subsequently was known to have been authoritative. This argument, based on inference and not on sound proof, pertains to the MT family, either as reflected in the texts found at the Judean Desert sites other than Qumran, being identical to the medieval tradition, or as found in the Qumran manuscripts that are somewhat more distant from the medieval tradition. In other words, since the medieval MT tradition was authoritative, the proto-Masoretic manuscripts also must have been authoritative. This also pertains to the manuscripts that are closely related to the LXX and the SP, both of which were authoritative in different communities. In all three cases, the forerunners of MT, LXX and SP must have been authoritative as well since their later representatives were authoritative in different communities. Some such early manuscripts were authoritative only in certain circles. Thus the proto-Masoretic texts presumably were authoritative in the temple circles, to the exclusion of other texts. Only after the destruction of the second temple was a single textual family authoritative throughout Israel; before that time, many different manuscripts were considered authoritative. As for Qumran, we have no reason to believe that one textual family was preferred to another at Qumran. Thus, all Scripture texts must have been equally authoritative in the Qumran compound, probably also in the Essene quarters elsewhere in Israel. The fact that the proto-MT texts prevail among the Torah texts and the independent texts among the other books makes no difference for this understanding.

2. A manuscript may be considered authoritative by a community if it was quoted in a composition written by that community. Thus, if we can prove that a Qumran composition quotes 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and not, for example, 1QIsa<sup>b</sup>, the former source must have been considered authoritative. This would be very difficult to prove in the case of these two manuscripts, because the differences between them are insufficiently clear and orthography and morphology alone cannot establish such a relation. Only rarely can a dependence be proven. Thus, while the first biblical quotation in the sectarian composition *4QTestimonia* (4Q175) is close to sp,<sup>49</sup> the third one, from Deut 33:8–11, is very close to 4QDeut<sup>h</sup>, and may have been based on that scroll or a similar one.<sup>50</sup> These two quotations show that the author of 4QTest quoted from at least two Scripture scrolls of a different character, a pre-Samaritan text and 4QDeut<sup>h</sup>, a textually independent text. In a completely different case, rabbinic literature almost exclusively quotes from the proto- MT, a text that must have been considered authoritative by the rabbis.<sup>51</sup>

3. One could claim that the mere fact that a composition was revised shows that its revisers considered it to be authoritative, but this is not a conclusive argument.

We do not really know what the members of the Qumran community thought about the textual variety among the Scripture manuscripts found in the various caves. Whether we assume that all the aforementioned texts were written at Qumran, or that only some were written there, while others were brought from elsewhere, the coexistence of the different categories of texts in the Qumran caves is noteworthy. The fact that all these different texts were found in the same caves reflects textual plurality not only at Qumran but also throughout Israel, probably for the period between the third century B.C.E. and the

<sup>49</sup> The nature of the first excerpt creates a somewhat unusual impression as it seems to quote from two pericopes in Deuteronomy (Deut 5:28–29; 18:18–19). However, in fact it contains merely one text that, as in sp (Exod 20:21), is composed of two pericopes that occur in different places in MT. For the same juxtaposition of texts, see 4QRP<sup>a</sup> 6.

<sup>50</sup> See E. Tov, “The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls to the Understanding of the LXX,” in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings* (ed. G.J. Brooke and B. Lindars; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1992), 11–47, esp. 31–35; J.A. Duncan, “New Readings for the ‘Blessing of Moses’ from Qumran,” *JBL* 114 (1995): 273–90.

<sup>51</sup> See E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2d rev. ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 33–35.

first century C.E.<sup>52</sup> Within that textual plurality, the large number of proto-Masoretic texts (in the Torah scrolls found at Qumran) probably indicates their importance, while the large number of independent texts (in the scrolls of other books) underlines the special condition of the transmission of the biblical text. Since there is no evidence concerning the circumstances surrounding the depositing of the scrolls in the caves or the different status of scrolls within the Qumran sect, no solid conclusions can be drawn about the approach of the Qumranites towards the text of Scripture. But it is safe to say that they paid no special attention to textual differences. This question probably never arose among the Qumranites, since they simply assembled different types of scrolls and used them on the same or different occasions.

If my own view about some of the Qumran scrolls is correct, a Qumran scribal school copied one-third of the Qumran Scripture scrolls, such as 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, at Qumran or elsewhere. How can we prove the authoritative status of that particular Isaiah scroll? This should not be an unusual question when comparing the scroll with a rather precise proto-MT scroll, 1QIsa<sup>b</sup>. The long scroll is full of omissions, mistakes, erasures, and supralinear additions and it is written in a very inconsistent and extremely full orthography. Judging by the rules written down at a later period in rabbinic literature, there was no room for such a sloppy scroll in protorabbinic circles, and it would not have been accepted in a synagogue because of the number of corrections in each column.<sup>53</sup> When Jesus opened an Isaiah scroll in a synagogue

<sup>52</sup> In recent years, the terms “pluriformity” and “uniformity” have appeared frequently in the scholarly discussion. See A. van der Kooij, “The Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible before and after the Qumran Discoveries,” in *The Bible as Book* (ed. Herbert and Tov), 167–77 (170–71). All agree that at a certain point there was uniformity, but scholars disagree as to how this uniformity was obtained. The term itself, as well as “stabilization,” may be misleading, as these terms presuppose a certain movement towards that unity, which actually did not take place. When the archeological evidence shows us that MT is the sole force in power in the first century C.E., this situation does not reflect a *Kulturkampf* between different texts, but resulted from the fact that other texts simply ceased to exist after the destruction of the second temple.

<sup>53</sup> For example, *Sop.* 3:8–9: “A scroll [some of whose letters] are faded may not be used for the lections. . . . A scroll of the Torah in which a whole line is faded may not be used for the lections. If the greater part of a line is faded and the smaller part intact, the use of the scroll is permitted. If a Torah scroll contains an error, it may not be used for the lections. How many? One in a column, is the view of R. Judah. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel says: Even if there be one error in three columns the scroll may not be used for the lections.” *Sop.* 3:14 “A scribe may not put upon the written part [of a Torah scroll] a reed-pen with ink on it.” *Sop.* 3:17 “It is obligatory to make beautiful *zizith*,

in Nazareth, he would not have opened one resembling the large Isaiah scroll.<sup>54</sup>

We cannot really prove the authoritative status of the large Isaiah scroll to the Qumran community. But it stands to reason that this scroll was considered authoritative at Qumran and elsewhere. The fact that this scroll was very well preserved is due to the fact that it was carefully stored in a jar.

In accordance with this analysis, if we are unable to prove the authoritative status of the five manuscripts of 4QRP with detailed arguments, neither are we able to prove such a status for most other Qumran Scripture scrolls. I believe that the default in our argumentation should always be the assumption that all scrolls we consider Scripture had an authoritative status.

Is there nevertheless some circumstantial evidence for the assumption that at least one of the 4QRP manuscripts was considered authoritative? The practice of indicating two dots before the divine name in 4QRP<sup>b</sup> may imply that this manuscript was considered authoritative. A dicolon (:), followed by a space, is systematically placed before the Tetragrammaton (written in the square script) in 4QRP<sup>b</sup>, written in the Qumran practice of orthography and morphology, e.g. 14 3 (Exod 24:17). This practice is not known from other sources, and it may be compared with other systems of reverential treatment of the Tetragrammaton, viz., the writing of that name in paleo-Hebrew characters, the use of four dots (“Tetrapuncta”), and the employment of a different color of ink in 11QpaleoUnidentified Text (11Q22).<sup>55</sup>

#### 4. CONCLUSION

In sum, the four manuscripts 4Q364–367 analyzed in the shadow of 4Q158, “4QBiblical Paraphrase,” were first named 4QPentateuch Paraphrase or 4QPP. Their first identity crisis was the change from 4QPP to 4QReworked Pentateuch, or 4QRP. The second identity crisis

---

beautiful *mezuzoth*, to write a beautiful scroll of the Torah with choice ink.” Chapters 4 and 5 of *Soperim* deal with the writing and erasure of divine names.

<sup>54</sup> According to Luke 4:16–21, Jesus entered the synagogue in Nazareth, a scroll of Isaiah was handed to him, he unrolled it, read the text, and then rolled the scroll back after use.

<sup>55</sup> See Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 218–21.

occurred when it was realized that this nonbiblical composition might actually reflect a group of Scripture texts, possibly to be named *4QPentateuch*. In 2005, I reached this understanding when analyzing three completely different texts, the Greek translations of 1 Kings, Esther and Daniel. I suggested that the *Vorlagen* of these three LXX books reflect stages subsequent to those in MT. All three books were based on underlying Semitic texts that rewrote texts resembling MT, adding and changing major sections in these books. We also found several characteristic features in these three LXX compositions that are shared with rewritten Bible compositions from Qumran. Upon discovering these features, I realized that they have implications for our understanding of 4QRP. Keeping in mind that the LXX includes exponents of major rewriting that have become authoritative Scripture, we should be open to the possibility that 4QRP constitutes a group of Scripture manuscripts that had the same level of authority as the Hebrew texts underlying the LXX. The main focus of our study was the second identity crisis of 4QRP. We sketched the textual and exegetical nature of the five manuscripts of 4QRP, and argued that these manuscripts enjoyed authoritative status even if this assumption cannot be proven in detail.

