

Reworked Pentateuch and Pentateuchal Theory

Reinhard G. Kratz

1 Introduction

After more than 250 years of critical research, the pentateuchal question is not solved yet. The current discussion is lively but, with the exception of some basic points of consensus, remains highly controversial and fractured.¹ A fresh approach is the view from outside, which takes the external evidence into account. There are two roads to be taken: one is to look for analogies in the ancient Near East (Gilgamesh Epic, Assyrian inscriptions) and in Second Temple literature (such as Jubilees, Temple Scroll, as well as Serekh Ha-Yahad, Damascus Document); the other is to start with the different forms of the Pentateuch in the manuscripts, versions (Septuagint [LXX], Samaritan Pentateuch [SP]), and excerpts of Rewritten Scripture (Jubilees, Temple Scroll, Genesis Apocryphon, etc.).

Both roads have already been taken in scholarship and have led, as is to be expected, to different results.² Jeffrey Tigay used ancient Near Eastern analogies in order to confirm the Documentary Hypothesis; Stephen Kaufman rejected, or rather relativized, the possibility of analyzing the Pentateuch and reconstructing its literary history on the basis of external analogies, taking the Temple Scroll as an example.³ David Carr and others have looked more broadly and found the evidence of analogies extremely complex, so much so that it would be (too) dif-

This paper was finished in the 2014–2015 academic year, which I spent as an Overseas Visiting Scholar at St John’s College, Cambridge. I would like to express my deep gratitude to the college as well as to my host, Dr. Nathan McDonald, who invited me and provided me with an extraordinary working environment, both hospitable and stimulating, which enabled me to complete this piece. English translation by Ruth Ludewig-Welch (Göttingen).

¹ See R.G. KRATZ, “The Pentateuch in Current Research: Consensus and Debate,” in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research* (ed. T.B. Dozeman et al.; FAT 78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 31–61, and the discussion documented in this volume.

² See R.G. KRATZ, “Innerbiblische Exegese und Redaktionsgeschichte im Lichte empirischer Evidenz,” in *Das Judentum im Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels* (ed. R.G. Kratz; 2nd ed.; FAT 42; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 126–156.

³ J.H. TIGAY, “An Empirical Basis for the Documentary Hypothesis,” *JBL* 94 (1975), 329–342; IDEM, *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982; repr., Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci, 2002); IDEM (ed.), *Empirical Models*

difficult to apply it to the analysis of the Hebrew Bible.⁴ More recent contributions, therefore, focus more and more on the textual history of the Pentateuch and other writings of the Hebrew Bible as a starting point for the analysis of a composition and the reconstruction of its literary and redactional history.⁵

In this paper I would like to follow this latter path⁶ and take the so-called Rewritten Pentateuch (RP) manuscripts from Qumran (4Q158 and 4Q364–367) – especially 4Q158 – as an example. These manuscripts move between a copy and a rewriting of the Pentateuch and thus have the advantage that they can function both as a different version and as an analogy. In other words: although I am taking the second road of textual history, the specific texts I am dealing with blur the distinction between the two roads of analogy and version. Furthermore, I want to confront the evidence in the RP manuscripts with the scholarly analysis of the parallel Masoretic Text in order to compare the compositional processes going on in both versions. Before we go into detail, a few general remarks are in order.

2 General Remarks

The edition and classification of the relevant material is still in process. Fragments of five manuscripts (4Q158 and 4Q364–367) are preserved.⁷ It is still an

for *Biblical Criticism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985); S. A. KAUFMAN, “The Temple Scroll and Higher Criticism,” *HUCA* 53 (1982), 29–43.

⁴ D. M. CARR, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); H. J. TERTEL, *Text and Transmission: An Empirical Model for the Literary Development of Old Testament Narratives* (BZAW 221; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994).

⁵ See already J. WELLHAUSEN, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1871); also TIGAY, “Empirical Basis” (see n. 3); IDEM, *Empirical Models* (see n. 3); CARR, *Formation* (see n. 4); recently, J. PAKKALA, *God’s Word Omitted: Omissions in the Transmission of the Hebrew Bible* (FRLANT 251; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013); D. A. TEETER, *Scribal Laws: Exegetical Variation in the Textual Transmission of Biblical Law in the Late Second Temple Period* (FAT 92; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014); R. MÜLLER et al., *Evidence of Editing: Growth and Change of Texts in the Hebrew Bible* (RBS 75; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014); U. BECKER and H. BEZZEL (eds.), *Rereading the relecture? The Question of (Post)chronistic Influence in the Latest Redactions of the Books of Samuel* (FAT 2/66; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014).

⁶ For the composition of the Temple Scroll as an analogy for the pentateuchal question, see R. G. KRATZ, “Sources, Fragments, and Additions: Biblical Criticism and the Dead Sea Scrolls” (forthcoming) and the relevant literature mentioned there.

⁷ J. M. ALLEGRO, *Biblical Paraphrase: Genesis, Exodus, Qumrân Cave 4 I (4Q158–186)* (DJD V; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), 1–6 + pl. 1; E. TOV and S. W. CRAWFORD, “Rewritten Pentateuch,” in *Qumran Cave 4 VIII, Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (ed. H. Attridge et al.; DJD XIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 187–352 + pl. 13–26; the images are available in the Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library of the IAA, Jerusalem (<http://www.iaa.org.il/>).

open question whether the five manuscripts are part of the same or different copies of the Pentateuch.⁸ The question whether the five manuscripts cover the entire Pentateuch or only parts of it is also a matter of debate; at least 4Q364 and 4Q365 clearly represent the whole, containing fragments from all parts, though 4Q364 does not contain any fragments from Leviticus.

The text form moves between the (Proto-)Masoretic and the Samaritan versions of the Pentateuch. It has a close affinity to the Proto-Samaritan text attested elsewhere in some manuscripts from Qumran but also has its peculiarities, which differ from both the Masoretic and the Samaritan versions. Therefore, it is much disputed whether the five manuscripts represent an edition of the “biblical” writing or another exemplar of Rewritten Scripture.⁹ Significant for this problem are, most notably, the contributions of Emanuel Tov, who in the course of time

deadseascrolls.org.il). For an introduction to the material, see E. TOV, “4QReworked Pentateuch: A Synopsis of its Contents,” *RevQ* 16 (1995), 647–653, reprinted in IDEM, *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible and Qumran: Collected Essays* (TSAJ 121; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 21–26; S. W. CRAWFORD, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2008), 19–30 and 39–59.

⁸ See G. J. BROOKE, “4Q158: Reworked Pentateuch^a or Reworked Pentateuch A?,” *DSD* 8 (2001), 219–241.

⁹ See E. ULRICH, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Text,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 1.79–100, here 88; IDEM, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999), 32, n. 51; IDEM, “The Qumran Scrolls and the Biblical Text,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (ed. L. H. Schiffman et al.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 51–59, here 57; IDEM, “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, here 76; M. SEGAL, “4QReworked Pentateuch or 4QPentateuch?,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (ed. L. H. Schiffman et al.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society 2000), 391–399; IDEM, “Between Bible and Rewritten Bible,” in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. M. Henze; Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2005), 10–28; A. LANGE, “The Status of the Biblical Texts in the Qumran Corpus and the Canonical Process,” in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (ed. E. D. Herbert and E. Tov; London: British Library, 2002), 21–30; M. M. ZAHN, “The Problem of Characterizing the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts: Bible, Rewritten Bible, or None of the Above,” *DSD* 15 (2008), 315–339; EADEM, “Building Textual Bridges: Towards an Understanding of 4Q158 (4QReworked Pentateuch A),” in *The Mermaid and the Partridge: Essays from the Copenhagen Conference on Revising Texts from Cave Four* (ed. G. J. Brooke and J. Høgenhaven; STDJ 96; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 13–32. For further discussion, see M. J. BERNSTEIN, “‘Rewritten Bible’: A Generic Category Which Has Outlived Its Usefulness?,” *Textus* 22 (2005), 169–196; IDEM, “What Has Happened to the Laws? The Treatment of Legal Material in 4QReworked Pentateuch,” *DSD* 15 (2008), 24–49; both articles are reprinted in IDEM, *Reading and Re-Reading Scripture at Qumran* (STDJ 107; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2013), 1:39–62, 476–497; CRAWFORD, *Rewriting Scripture* (see n. 7), 56–57.

has changed his mind and now advocates for their designation as “biblical” manuscripts.¹⁰ The same (Proto-Samaritan) textual tradition seems to underlie the excerpts and the rewriting of the biblical text in the Temple Scroll.¹¹ This classification does not exclude changes that go beyond the usual smaller variants but, on the contrary, includes rearrangements, omissions, and additions as we find them in 4Q364 and especially in 4Q365 and 4Q158.¹²

If this classification of the 4QRP manuscripts as editions of the “biblical” text – equal to the Masoretic or the Samaritan versions – is correct, the implications of these different versions of the Pentateuch for the pentateuchal question, i.e., the question of the composition of the Pentateuch, are obvious. Taking 4Q158 as an example, the differences between this version and the other versions (Masoretic Text, Samaritan Pentateuch) – which concern both the arrangement of the material and the text – seem, at least to me, to be significant with respect to redaction history. The evidence allows two basic conclusions.

First, we may draw a conclusion with respect to the comparability and applicability of the evidence. The kind of difference that we find in the RP texts

¹⁰ See E. TOV, “The Textual Status of 4Q364–367 (4QRP),” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18–21 March 1991* (ed. J. Treballe Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 42–82; IDEM, “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.C. VanderKam; Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 111–134; IDEM, “Rewritten Bible Compositions and Biblical Manuscripts, with Special Attention to the Samaritan Pentateuch,” *DSD* 5 (1998), 334–354, reprinted in IDEM, *Hebrew Bible* (see n. 7), 57–70; IDEM, “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; Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal, 20.–23. Juli 2006* (ed. M. Karrer and W. Kraus; WUNT 219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 369–393, reprinted in IDEM, *Hebrew Bible*, 283–308; IDEM, “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 et al.; FRLANT 230; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009), 11–28; IDEM, “From 4QReworked Pentateuch to 4QPentateuch (?),” in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism* (ed. M. Popović; JSJSup 141; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 73–91; IDEM, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (3rd ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012), 323.

¹¹ See M. M. ZAHN, “4QReworked Pentateuch C and the Literary Sources of the Temple Scroll: A New (Old) Proposal,” *DSD* 19 (2012), 133–158, contra S. W. CRAWFORD, “Three Fragments from Cave Four and Their Relationship to the Temple Scroll,” *JQR* 85 (1994), 259–273. For the classification of 4Q365^a as 4QTemple^a, see TOV and CRAWFORD, “Reworked Pentateuch” (see n. 7).

¹² See M. SEGAL, “Biblical Exegesis in 4Q158: Techniques and Genre,” *Textus* 19 (1998), 45–62; M. M. ZAHN, *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts* (STDJ 95; Leiden: Brill, 2011); and the relevant contributions of Sidnie White Crawford and Molly M. Zahn in this volume.

is not a new phenomenon. It occurs not only in other versions such as the Proto-Samaritan Pentateuch but also in other cases. It is encountered, for example, in the relationship of Chronicles to the books of Samuel and Kings, for which there is an additional textual witness in the manuscript of 4QSam^a. Sometimes the objection is raised that it is precisely the external evidence that proves that our usual methods of internal analysis are inadequate. If we only had Chronicles, it is said, then, using the classical – some say “traditional” – methods of source and redaction criticism (*Literar-* and *Redaktionskritik*), we would never be able to reconstruct the older version of Samuel and Kings.¹³ Correspondingly, if we had only 4Q158 as a basis for the internal analysis, we would never obtain the biblical version of Genesis and Exodus.

The objection is undoubtedly justified. However, it does not follow that internal literary-historical analysis is obsolete. Various textual witnesses show that on the way from the *Vorlage* to later versions, we must assume an infinite number of intermediate stages of which we are not aware. The versions that have been passed down to us are only sporadic stations in an extremely complex literary and textual history. And yet, they give us insight into the multiplicity of possibilities to be expected, some of which (with luck) can be proven or made plausible on the basis of the available textual evidence and others that will probably remain hidden forever. This means that 4Q158 and the Reworked Pentateuch texts, just like the Proto-Samaritan version, are witnesses to the way in which the version preserved in the Masoretic Text could have come into being – no more, no less.

If this is the case, then the external evidence allows a further basic conclusion to be drawn. This conclusion concerns the methodological options for how to explain the evidence. At no point in 4Q158, the other RP texts, or even Chronicles does the Documentary Hypothesis immediately suggest itself as an explanation of the similarities and differences between the different versions of basically the same text. Nowhere are multiple versions – i.e., “sources” or “documents” containing the same story, which emerged independently and which later would have been conflated mechanically with each other – presupposed. In addition, the classical Fragmentary Hypothesis, which says that diverse, free-floating pieces or “sources” were fitted together by a redactor, cannot, as far as I can see, be observed in the relationship of the RP texts to their “biblical” parallels.¹⁴

¹³ See CARR, *Formation* (see n. 4), 57–65, 73–80, and especially 146; TERTEL, *Text and Transmission* (see n. 4), 56–67, 156–171.

¹⁴ The Fragmentary or “Source” Hypothesis is often used to explain the new material (*Sondergut*) in the Rewritten Bible (or Rewritten Scripture) texts. For the Temple Scroll, see A. M. WILSON and L. WILLS, “Literary Sources of the *Temple Scroll*,” *HTR* 75 (1982), 275–288; M. O. WISE, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11* (SAOC 49; Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1990); for Jubilees, M. SEGAL, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology* (JSJSup 117; Leiden: Brill, 2007). There are, however, different approaches; for Jubilees, see C. BERNER,

What can be observed, however, is the merging or even harmonization of two different versions of a text (e.g., Exod 20 and Deut 5 in 4Q158). What can further be observed is the supplementation of a presupposed text with material that came from elsewhere, be it the oral tradition or other written sources, some of which are known to us from biblical tradition and some of which are unknown (frag. 14 in 4Q158, etc.; cf. the distinctive material [*Sondergut*] in Chronicles). In both cases, the differences in the arrangement and the version of the text rest on a more or less direct relationship of literary dependence between the “biblical” text (the *Vorlage*) and the other versions.

This means that, in order to explain the relationship between the different versions of the Pentateuch (MT, Proto-Samaritan, RP), the classical Supplementary Hypothesis or revisional approach seems to be the most appropriate. This hypothesis does include elements of the Documentary (or Source) and Fragmentary Hypotheses but cannot be replaced by them. If we assume this to be true for the external evidence, then the same must also be valid for the internal analysis and thus has important implications for pentateuchal theory.

Now let us turn to our sample text, 4Q158. I chose three examples, which I want to consider from the two vantage points of the RP and the Masoretic Text: the patriarchal references, the mountain of God, and the Decalogue. In addition, I will briefly discuss the minor alterations of the text.

3 Patriarchal References

Let us begin with the first example, the references to the patriarchs. 4Q158 is probably – or rather, certainly – a copy of the Exodus scroll, whether just this individual scroll or part of a larger composition that also included Genesis, or the entire Pentateuch.¹⁵ In any case, what we find in several places in the context of this Exodus scroll are additional references to the patriarchs, which we do not find in the Masoretic Text.¹⁶

Jahre, Jahrwochen und Jubiläen: Heptadische Geschichtskonzeptionen im Antiken Judentum (BZAW 363; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006); J.L. KUGEL, *A Walk through Jubilees: Studies of the Book of Jubilees and the World of Its Creation* (JSJSup 156; Leiden: Brill, 2012); for the Temple Scroll, KRATZ, “Sources, Fragments, and Additions” (see n. 6).

¹⁵ For the identification of the book of Exodus, see J. STRUGNELL, “Notes en marge du volume V de ‘Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan,’” *RevQ* 7 (1970), 163–276, here 169; SEGAL, “Exegesis” (see n. 12), 48; ZAHN, *Rethinking* (see n. 12), 55–56.

¹⁶ For the following I refer to the transcription and translation of ZAHN, *Rethinking* (see n. 12), 245–258; EADEM, “Building” (see n. 9). For the text, see also A. B. PERRIN, “Towards a New Edition of 4QReworkedPentateuch^a (4Q158): Text, Translation, Variants and Notes,” in *Celebrating the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Canadian Collection* (ed. J. Duhaime et al.; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 59–76; IDEM, “The Variants of 4Q(Reworked) Pentateuch: A Comprehensive List of the Textual Variants in 4Q158, 4Q364–367 in Biblical Sequence,”

- A. In frags. 1–2 we find an additional reference to Jacob, with a repetition of Gen 32:25–32 before Exod 4:27–28.¹⁷
- B. In frag 4:6–7 we find a reference to Abraham in the sacrifice scene of Exod 24:3–8, alluding to the showing of the land (Gen 12:1; 13:14–15; cf. Exod 6:3) and the covenant (Gen 17:7; Exod 6:4).¹⁸
- C. Another added reference to the patriarchs is the promise of the land in frag. 3, with an allusion to Gen 49:1 or 47:29–30.¹⁹
- D. In my opinion, the surplus in the blessing of Jacob in frags. 1–2, lines 7–9 belongs to the same category. Here, within the rendering of Gen 32, the combination of the roots בָּרַךְ and פָּרַח recalls not only Gen 28:3 but also Gen 35:9–12; thus, both passages wherein Jacob is renamed Israel (Gen 32 and 35) are in view.²⁰

The compositional technique used here is intertextuality, which creates textual links within a larger composition. What implications do these intertextual connections have for pentateuchal theory?

Let us begin with the repetition of Gen 32:25–33 in Exod 4 (frags. 1–2). In 4Q158 this repetition seems to be an addition that has been inserted between the “bridegroom of blood” pericope in Exod 4:24–26 and the meeting of Aaron and Moses at the mountain of God in Exod 4:27–28, which follows in frags. 1–2, lines 14–15. This assumption is supported by the word שְׂרִית in line 2 of frags. 1–2, which most commentators leave unexplained.²¹ It is most likely the verbal form *sārītā* “you have wrestled” from Gen 32:29. What has irritated scholars is the fact that, in some sense, the word is in the wrong place, namely *before* the scene of Gen 32:25–33, in which it would have been expected in frags. 1–2, lines 5–6 (where one has to restore, *ועם אנשים ותוכל*, *כי שרית עם אלהים*). This

JJS 63 (2012), 127–157; for the analysis of the text, see SEGAL, “Exegesis” (see n. 12); ZAHN, *Rethinking*, 25–74.

¹⁷ SEGAL, “Exegesis” (see n. 12), 47–48; ZAHN, *Rethinking* (see n. 12), 27–29, 41–43, 45–48, 54–56.

¹⁸ SEGAL, “Exegesis” (see n. 12), 49–50; ZAHN, *Rethinking* (see n. 12), 48–54.

¹⁹ SEGAL, “Exegesis” (see n. 12), 53–54; ZAHN, *Rethinking* (see n. 12), 62–63.

²⁰ SEGAL, “Exegesis” (see n. 12), 59–60; ZAHN, *Rethinking* (see n. 12), 27–29. There is a possible overlap with 4Q364 frag. 5, col. ii.

²¹ ZAHN, *Rethinking* (see n. 12), 54–56, 246–247, 259; SEGAL, “Exegesis” (see n. 12), 48, rightly sees the relation to the Jacob story in Gen 32 and Hos 12:4, 5 but does not offer an explanation for the position of the word before the retelling of Gen 32. Hos 12, too, makes a connection between Jacob and Moses. The following interpretation is based on the assumption that the “bridegroom of blood” pericope preceded the retelling of Gen 32:25–33. A different interpretation is necessary if the reading *שרית ופליטה*, “remnant and survivor,” is correct (for the expression, see 1 Kgs 19:31 // Isa 37:32; Ezra 9:14, as well as 1QS 4:14 // 4Q257 5:13; CD 2:6 // 4Q266 2 ii:6; 4Q374 2ii:4; further 1QM 1:6), which might also be an allusion to the Jacob story (Gen 32:9); for the reading, see E. QIMRON, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2010–2014), 3:16.

suggests that the second-person singular “you” of שרית in line 2 is most likely referring not to Jacob but to Moses (or Zipporah) and is a secondary reference to the preceding pericope of the “bridegroom of blood” in Exod 4:24–26. As a result of the similarity between the fight at Yabok (כַּף הַיַּבֹּק) and the “bridegroom of blood” (תַּתְּן־דָּמִים),²² the pericope in Gen 32 was inserted at this point in order to make the relationship explicit before the text continues with Exod 4:27–28 in 4Q158 frags. 1–2, lines 14–15. A retrospective, which compared the “wrestling” of Moses (or Zipporah) with the “wrestling” of Jacob, might have been used as the transition for interpolating the pericope at this point. However, it must be admitted that we are not certain which text preceded the rendering of Gen 32 in our Exodus scroll and that the interpretation offered here only works if it was the “bridegroom of blood” pericope.

With the reproduction of Gen 32 within the context of Exod 4, further changes are made in the text of Gen 32 itself. One change – clearly recognizable as an addition by means of *Wiederaufnahme*²³ – is the surplus in the blessing of Gen 32:30–31 in frags. 1–2, lines 7–9. Here, expressions are used that recall Gen 28:3 and Gen 35:9–12 in particular but that also contain new material. Another change within the rendering of Gen 32 in frag 1–2 of our manuscript is the interpretation of the dietary law in Gen 32:33 concerning the sciatic nerve (גֵּיד הַנְּזֵפָה) as *halakah*, which is clearly ascribed to divine law (frags. 1–2, lines 11–13).²⁴ Unlike other versions, such as Jub 48:2–3, events depicted in the “bridegroom of blood” pericope are not explained as being the result of an attack by Mastema or other evil powers but are conceived in the sense of Gen 32 as a narrative about blessing and *halakah*. This is probably the reason why this version of the text reproduces Gen 32 at this point in Exod 4.

For the sake of a cross-check, let us for a moment forget the Masoretic Text. If we did not have the Masoretic Text but only 4Q158 (without Genesis), we would take the passage from Gen 32 in frags. 1–2 as an integral part of the Exodus scroll. Some scholars, especially those who believe in the literary integrity of the Scriptures and work with the canonical approach, would certainly take it as an original passage of this scroll. Still, literary critics with a trained eye for compositional techniques would not hesitate to regard the passage as an addition, which interrupts the older connection between Exod 4:20–26 and 4:27–28, regardless of the origin of the material. Since we know the Masoretic Text, the piece proves itself to be an additional (secondary) intertextual connection, which

²² For a contextual reading and the relation between the “bridegroom of blood” and Exod 4:21–23 as well as Gen 32, see B.P. ROBINSON, “Zipporah to the Rescue: A Contextual Study of Exodus IV 24–6,” *VT* 36 (1986), 447–461, 450–452; for earlier witnesses of this relation, see ZAHN, *Rethinking* (see n. 12), 55, n. 52 with reference to Rashbam and Moshe Greenberg.

²³ The phrase ויברך אותו שם from Gen 32:30 (= frags. 1–2, line 7) was the motivation for the addition, which ends with the words בברכו אותו שם in line 10, before the text of Gen 32:31 continues.

²⁴ ZAHN, *Rethinking* (see n. 12), 41–43.

multiplies the references to the patriarchs, of which there are already a number in Exod 3–4 and 6. The same can be said of the reference to Abraham in frag. 4.

But the references that are to be found in the Masoretic Text are not only multiplied but also used to make certain implications explicit and to implement them in the basic narrative. Thus, the explicit prohibition of eating the sciatic nerve (גֵיד הַנֶּזֶף), in frags. 1–2, lines 11–13, and other examples stress the correspondence of divine commands and their exact execution,²⁵ which is to be found in a number of other cases in the base text as well. In terms of pentateuchal theory, this means that we are dealing with extensions or supplements to an older base text. The Documentary or Fragmentary Hypothesis is excluded here.

Let us now turn our attention to the Masoretic Text itself. What we can discern in 4Q158 can, to some extent, also be observed in the Masoretic version. I will not be able to offer a complete analysis here, but I will mention a few of the issues.

There is consensus among scholars that the references to the patriarchs in Exod 3–4 and in Exod 6 are (relatively) late texts. Exodus 6:2–12 belongs to P (the Priestly writing). Here, it is a matter of debate whether P is a source or a revision.²⁶ In light of 4Q158, the evidence for the revisional theory increases, regardless of whether the revision took place in the same literary context or in a separate writing. Be that as it may, with its concept of blessing, P seems to presuppose the blessing/curse theme in Gen 1–11 and 12:1–3 in the non-Priestly text.²⁷

Exodus 3–4 is regarded by many scholars as a very late, post-Priestly text, serving as a secondary connection between the patriarchs and the exodus.²⁸ Others divide the text into the sources J and E and assign the patriarchal references (with the exception of Exod 4:5) to E.²⁹ But however we evaluate or divide the text, it is precisely the explicit references to the patriarchs that scholars

²⁵ ZAHN, *Rethinking* (see n. 12), 37–48.

²⁶ See R. G. KRATZ, *Die Komposition der erzählenden Bücher des Alten Testaments* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 113–116, 247–248; English translation, IDEM, *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament* (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 109–113, 244–246; IDEM, “Pentateuch” (see n. 1), 36–38.

²⁷ See KRATZ, *Komposition* (see n. 26), 233, 248 (*Composition* [see n. 26], 232, 245); IDEM, “Pentateuch” (see n. 1), 51–52, n. 65.

²⁸ E. BLUM, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* (BZAW 189; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990), 20–28; K. SCHMID, *Erzväter und Exodus: Untersuchungen zur doppelten Begründung der Ursprünge Israels innerhalb der Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments* (WMANT 81; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1999), 186–208; English translation, IDEM, *Genesis and the Moses Story: Israel's Dual Origins in the Hebrew Bible* (trans. J. D. Nogalski; Siphrut: Literature and Theology of the Hebrew Scriptures 3; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010).

²⁹ Thus M. NOTH, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer 1948), 39; on Exod 4:4 see 31 (“J” in brackets).

have excluded as later additions to this text.³⁰ The relevant passages containing references to the patriarchs that are held to be later additions to the text follow, with additions indented.

Exodus 3:5–7

וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים אֶל־מֹשֶׁה מֵעַל רִגְלֶיךָ כִּי הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר אָתָּה עוֹמֵד עָלָיו אֲדַמְתִּי־קֹדֶשׁ הוּא :
 וַיֹּאמֶר אֲנֹכִי אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם אֱלֹהֵי יִצְחָק וְאֱלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב
 וַיִּסְתֵּר מֹשֶׁה פָּנָיו כִּי יָרָא מֵהַבְּיַט אֱלֹהֵי־אֱלֹהִים :
 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה רְאֵה רְאֵה אֲתִי־עֲנֵי עָמִי אֲשֶׁר בְּמִצְרַיִם וְאֲתִי־צַעֲקֶתָם שְׁמַעְתִּי מִפְּנֵי נַגְשָׁיו כִּי יִדְעֹתִי
 אֲתִי־מִכְּאֲבֹי :

And He said, “Do not come closer. Remove your sandals from your feet, for the place on which you stand is holy ground.

I am,” He said, “the God of your father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.”

And Moses hid his face, for he was afraid to look at God.

And YHWH continued, “I have marked well the plight of My people in Egypt and have heeded their outcry because of their taskmasters; yes, I am mindful of their sufferings.”

Exodus 3:13–16

וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֱלֹהֵי־אֱלֹהִים הַנְּהַ אֲנֹכִי בָּא אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאָמַרְתִּי לָהֶם אֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתֵיכֶם שְׁלַחְנִי אֵלֵיכֶם
 וְאָמְרוּ־לִי מַה־שְּׁמוֹ מַה אֶמַּר אֲלֵהֶם :
 וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים אֶל־מֹשֶׁה אֱהִיָּה אֲשֶׁר אֱהִיָּה וַיֹּאמֶר כֹּה תֹאמַר לְבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֱהִיָּה שְׁלַחְנִי אֵלֵיכֶם :
 וַיֹּאמֶר עוֹד אֱלֹהִים אֶל־מֹשֶׁה כֹּה־תֹאמַר אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֹתֵיכֶם אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם
 אֱלֹהֵי יִצְחָק וְאֱלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב שְׁלַחְנִי אֵלֵיכֶם זֶה־שְּׁמִי לְעֹלָם וְזֶה זְכְרִי לְדֹר דָּר :
 לְךָ וְאֶסְפֹּת אֶת־זַקְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֹתֵיכֶם נִרְאָה אֵלַי
 אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם יִצְחָק וְיַעֲקֹב
 לֵאמֹר פְּקֹד פְּקֹדְתִי אֶתְכֶם וְאֲתִי־הַעֲשׂוּי לְכֶם בְּמִצְרַיִם :

Moses said to God, “When I come to the Israelites and say to them ‘The God of your fathers has sent me to you,’ and they ask me, ‘What is His name?’ what shall I say to them?”

And God said to Moses, “*Ehyé ’āšer ’ehyé.*” He continued, “Thus shall you say to the Israelites, ‘*Ehyé* sent me to you.’”

And God said further to Moses, “Thus shall you speak to the Israelites: YHWH, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, has sent me to you: This shall be My name forever, This My appellation for all eternity.”

“Go and assemble the elders of Israel and say to them: YHWH, the God of your fathers has appeared to me,

the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob

and said: ‘I have taken note of you and of what is being done to you in Egypt.’”

³⁰ C. LEVIN, *Der Jahwist* (FRLANT 157; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 332; J. C. GERTZ, *Tradition und Redaktion in der Exoduserzählung: Untersuchungen zur Endredaktion des Pentateuch* (FRLANT 186; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 270–271, 294–295, differently on Exod 4:5, 312, and cf. 363; C. BERNER, *Die Exoduserzählung: Das literarische Werden einer Ursprungslegende Israels* (FAT 73; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 83–85, 88, 90–91, 104, 111, 134.

Exodus 4:4–6

וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה שְׁלַח יָדְךָ וְאַחֲזוּ בְזָנְבוֹ וַיִּשְׁלַח יָדוֹ וַיַּחֲזֶק בּוֹ וַיְהִי לְמִטָּה בְּכַפּוֹ :
 לְמַעַן יֵאמְרוּ כִּי־נִרְאָה אֵלֶיךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתָם אֱלֹהֵי יִצְחָק וְאֱלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב :
 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה לוֹ עוֹד הִבֵּאתָ יָדְךָ בְּחִיקוֹ וַיָּבֵא יָדוֹ בְּחִיקוֹ

Then YHWH said to Moses, “Put out your hand and grasp it by the tail” – he put out his hand and seized it, and it became a rod in his hand –

“that they may believe that the LORD, the God of their fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, did appear to you.”

YHWH said to him further, “Put your hand into your bosom.” He put his hand into his bosom.

If the assumption is correct that the references to the patriarchs (noted by indentation) are later additions, the evidence in Exod 3–4 is in line with what we can observe in 4Q158: the additions create an explicit connection between the exodus narrative and the patriarchs in Exod 3–4. This connection is further explained by the Priestly layer in Exod 6, which provides a step-by-step system of revelation of God’s name! This process of intertextual linking between the patriarchal narrative and the Moses narrative is continued in 4Q158 with the repetition of Gen 32 in Exod 4 and the further references to the patriarchs.

4 The Mountain of God

My second example is the interrelation of the mountain of God in Exod 3–4 and 19–24 which, again, is to be found in 4Q158 frags. 1–2 and 4.³¹ In frags. 1–2, lines 16–19, at Exod 4:27–28, the command for the exodus from Exod 3:12 is repeated, and in frag. 4 the execution of a sacrifice is described in the words of Exod 24:3–8. However, frag. 4 clearly alludes to Exod 3:12 and 24:3–8 in the context of Exod 4 before the Sinai pericope is reproduced in frags. 5–12 and 13.

Based on the remnants of Exod 19–22 in frags. 5–12 and of Exod 30 in frag. 13, we do not know whether Exod 24 was reproduced again in 4Q158. I suspect that the chapter was reproduced at its original position in Exod 24. Similar to the case of שְׂרִית from Gen 32 in frags. 1–2, in frag. 4 we are dealing with an anticipation and secondary combination—in this case, the juxtaposition of the mountain of God in Exod 3–4 with Mount Sinai in Exod 19–24. The expression in frag. 4, line 1, צוה לכה, “he commanded you,” refers to Exod 3:12 (and 3:18). Here, the exodus is connected with the “worship” at the mountain of God from Exod 3 (תַּעֲבֹדוּן אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים עַל הַהָר הַזֶּה). It is this command that is executed in frag. 4 in the context of Exod 4 according to the example of the later scene in Exod 24:4–8. Thus, the two mountains, the mountain of God in Exod 3–4 and Mount Sinai in Exod 19–24, are correlated, which is indeed suggested by the

³¹ For the following, see STRUGNELL, “Notes” (see n. 15), 169–170; SEGAL, “Exegesis” (see n. 12), 49–53; ZAHN, *Rethinking* (see n. 12), 43–54.

name of the mountain, “the mountain of God” (הַר הָאֱלֹהִים), in Exod 3:1 and the description of the thorn bush, הַסִּינָי, in Exod 3:2.

Again, intertextual references or implications, which are already to be found in the (Proto-Masoretic) base text, are made explicit and implemented in the basic narrative in 4Q158. Here, the sacrifice and the covenant from Exod 24:4–8 gets a new interpretation in the context of Exod 3–4. So in frag. 4, lines 6–8 the covenant of Exod 24 is rephrased in the light of the patriarchal blessings and the covenant formula from Gen 12–13, Gen 17, and Exod 6.³² Here, too, the secondary alignments would also be recognizable as such, even if we only knew the version in 4Q158. This means that the Documentary or Fragmentary Hypothesis is quite out of the question as a model for explanation; only the Supplementary or Revisional Hypothesis can be considered a suitable explanation for the redactional activity that is observed in 4Q158.

How about the Masoretic Text itself? Again, the redactional process going on in 4Q158 is already in the offing.³³ Here, the decisive element is Exod 4:27, where 4Q158 adds the command from Exod 3:12 in the conversation between Moses and Aaron. In the Masoretic version of Exod 4:27, the localization at the mountain of God is an anachronism, as Moses has long since returned to Egypt (v. 20, וַיָּשָׁב אֶרֶצָה מִצְרַיִם). Originally this was followed either by the exodus (Exod 12:35–38 after 3:21–22) or the meeting with the pharaoh and the stories of the plagues (Exod 3:16–20/4:27–31). Therefore, Exod 4:27 is usually considered to be secondary.³⁴

Exodus 4:20, 27–31

ויקח משה את־אשתו ואת־בניו וירכבם על־החמר וישב ארצה מצרים [...] ויאמר יהוה אל־אהרן לדך לקראת משה המדברך וילדך ויפגשוו בהר האלהים וישקלו : ויצד משה לאהרן את כל־דברי יהוה אשר שלחו ואת כל־האמת אשר צוהו : וילדך משה ואהרן ויאספו את־כָּל־זקני בני ישראל : וידבר אהרן את כל־הדברים אשר־דבר יהוה אל־משה ויעש האתת לעיני העם : ויאמן העם וישמעו כִּי־פקד יהוה את־בני ישראל וכי ראה את־עניו ויקדו וישתחוו :

So Moses took his wife and sons, mounted them on an ass, and went back to the land of Egypt; [. . .]

YHWH said to Aaron, “Go to meet Moses in the wilderness.” He went and met him at the mountain of God, and he kissed him.

Moses told Aaron about all the things that YHWH had committed to him and all the signs about which He had instructed him.

Then Moses and Aaron went and assembled all the elders of the Israelites.

Aaron repeated all the words that YHWH had spoken to Moses, and he performed the signs in the sight of the people,

³² Cf. SEGAL, “Exegesis” (see n. 12), 49–51; ZAHN, *Rethinking* (see n. 12), 52–53.

³³ For the following, see C. BERNER, “The Redaction History of the Sinai Pericope (Exod 19–24) and Its Continuation in 4Q158,” *DSD* 20 (2013), 376–407, here 399–406.

³⁴ LEVIN, *Jahwist* (see n. 30), 333; GERTZ, *Tradition* (see n. 30), 334; BERNER, *Exoduszählung* (see n. 30), 115.

and the people were convinced. When they heard that YHWH had taken note of the Israelites and that He had seen their plight, they bowed low in homage.

However, there is some controversy here: is only the mention of Aaron secondary³⁵ or are all of the Aaron passages in Exod 3–4 (including 5:1–2 and the plagues) interpolations?³⁶ It has also been suggested that only Exod 4:27 is a secondary addition.³⁷ Be that as it may, it is obvious that this verse creates a problem. It interprets the return in v. 20 in terms of a departure and shifts the scene that follows in v. 28(–31) to the mountain of God. Here, Moses and Aaron, according to Exod 4:28–31, pass the instructions from Exod 3:16–18 on to the people. Exodus 3:16–18, in turn, mentions a “sacrifice in the wilderness” that serves as a pretext for the departure (see Exod 10).

Furthermore, Exod 4:27 alludes to Moses’s stop at the mountain of God in Exod 3:1, 12. This allusion itself is also often considered to be secondary. Of particular interest is Exod 3:12b, which connects the exodus with worship at the mountain of God and is likely to be an addition within Exod 3:9–14.³⁸

Exodus 3:11–12

וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל־הָאֱלֹהִים מִי אֲנֹכִי כִּי אֵלֶךְ אֶל־פַּרְעֹה וְכִי אוֹצִיא אֶת־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל מִמִּצְרָיִם
וַיֹּאמֶר כִּי־אֶהְיֶה עִמָּךְ

וְהָיָה לְךָ הָאוֹת כִּי אֲנֹכִי שְׁלַחְתִּיךָ בְּהוֹצִיאֲךָ אֶת־הָעָם מִמִּצְרָיִם תַּעֲבֹדוּן אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים עַל הַהָר הַזֶּה
But Moses said to God, “Who am I that I should go to Pharaoh and free the Israelites from Egypt?”

And He said, “I will be with you.

And that shall be your sign that it was I who sent you. And when you have freed the people from Egypt, you shall worship God at this mountain.”

The motive of “worship at this mountain” in v. 12 is not quite in agreement with the “sacrifice in the wilderness” in v. 18. Still, it can be assumed that this motive, too, hints at the sacrifice in Exod 24 and the cult in the tabernacle of Sinai, along with similar worship references in the plague episodes.³⁹

After all, it is already apparent in the Masoretic version that Mount Sinai in Exod 19–24 has been connected secondarily with the mountain of God and the “thorn bush” (הַסִּינָה) in Exod 3–4. This connection is realized firstly by Exod 3:12, which anticipates the sacrificial scene of Exod 24, and secondly by Exod 4:27, which sends Aaron to the mountain of God and refers back to Exod 3:1,

³⁵ NOTH, *Überlieferungsgeschichte* (see n. 29), 32, n. 104; LEVIN, *Jahwist* (see n. 30), 330, 333; also BERNER, *Exoduszählung* (see n. 30), 93 for 4:29 and 5:1; BLUM, *Studien* (see n. 28), 27–28; GERTZ, *Tradition* (see n. 30), 336 for 5:1, etc.

³⁶ KRATZ, *Komposition* (see n. 26), 296–300 (*Composition* [see n. 26], 287–291).

³⁷ BERNER, *Exoduszählung* (see n. 30), 115.

³⁸ LEVIN, *Jahwist* (see n. 30), 331; GERTZ, *Tradition* (see n. 30), 292–294; BERNER, *Exoduszählung* (see n. 30), 80–83, 103.

³⁹ Exod 7:16, 26; 8:16, “worship”; also 5:1, “celebration”; animals for sacrifice in the wilderness, 10:7–11, 24–26; 12:31–32.

12b (mountain of God) and 3:16–18 (sacrifice in the wilderness, reference to the patriarchs).

4Q158 puts two and two together and lets a sacrificial act follow the meeting of Moses and Aaron at the mountain of God in Exod 4:27–28. This sacrificial act, however, not only corresponds to the command in Exod 3:12, as well as the sacrifice on Mount Sinai in Exod 24:4–8, but it also connects the covenant of Exod 24 to the patriarchs.⁴⁰ In this way, the mountain of God and Mount Sinai are identified as one and the same in 4Q158, and the covenant at Sinai is traced back to the covenant with the patriarchs, thus following the example of the Priestly writing in Gen 17 and Exod 29 and 40.⁴¹

So we can conclude that the literary processes to be observed in the biblical text, especially Exod 3–4 and 24, prepare for the further interpretation of 4Q158. In both cases, intertextual links are used to connect and interpret texts that are usually assigned to the independent sources J, E, and P. Thus, the evidence both in the Masoretic Text and in 4Q158 is to be explained most simply with the Supplementary or Revisional Hypothesis, rather than by either the Documentary or the Fragmentary Hypothesis.

5 The Decalogue

Having considered two examples with intertextual links, our third example will lead us to another phenomenon of redactional activity: the issue of different versions of a text, and the tendency to harmonize parallel passages.⁴² This can be seen in 4Q158 frags. 6–9, which reproduce the Sinai pericope, particularly the material of Exod 20.⁴³

The text of 4Q158 shows a close proximity to the Samaritan (SP) and the Proto-Samaritan (4QpaleoExod^m) versions of the Pentateuch and at the same time contains a number of significant differences from both the Masoretic and the Samaritan traditions. Also, the arrangement of the text is similar to, but not at all identical with, that of SP. Following Exod 19 in frag. 5, we find the following sequence:⁴⁴

⁴⁰ See above, n. 32.

⁴¹ KRATZ, *Komposition* (see n. 26), 246 (*Composition* [see n. 26], 243).

⁴² For the tendency of harmonization in the Proto-Samaritan Pentateuch and the 4QRP texts, see CRAWFORD, *Rewriting* (see n. 7), 22–34, 40–46; for specification, see ZAHN, *Rethinking* (see n. 12), 233–236.

⁴³ See SEGAL, “Exegesis” (see n. 12), 55–59; ZAHN, *Rethinking* (see n. 12), 27–34, 37–40, 63–67.

⁴⁴ The chart follows, with a few specifications, SEGAL, “Exegesis” (see n. 12), 56. The placement of frag. 6 before frags. 7–9 is not questionable; it is based on the similarity to the Proto-Samaritan (Segal, “Exegesis,” n. 31) and the fact that the replacement of the Decalogue is connected to further extensions of the Proto-Samaritan version. See also ZAHN, *Rethinking*

<i>MT</i>	<i>(Proto-)Samaritan</i>	<i>4Q158</i>
		<i>Frag. 6</i>
Decalogue	Decalogue	not preserved
Exod 20:18–19a α	Exod 20:18–19a α	not preserved
Exod 20:19a β	Deut 5:24–27	Deut 5:(24–)27 ⁴⁵
Exod 20:19b–21	Exod 20:19b–21	Exod 20:19b–21
Exod 20:22a α	Exod 20:22a α	Exod 20:22a α ⁴⁶
	Deut 5:28b–29	Deut 5:28b–29
		Plus
	Deut 18:18–22	Deut 18:18–22
		<i>Frag. 7–9</i>
		Exod 20:12–17 (Decalogue)
		Exod 20:22a α ⁴⁷
	Deut 5:30–31	Deut 5:30–31
		Plus
Exod 20:22a β β , 23, etc.	Exod 20:22–23, etc.	Exod 20:22 ⁴⁸ –21:25

From this chart it is obvious that 4Q158 differs from the Proto-Samaritan in two respects: first, the position of the Decalogue (at least the second part of it) is changed; second, there are three extensions of the text, which seem to be connected to the replacement of the Decalogue (frag. 6, lines 5–6; frags. 7–9, lines 3, 4–5). The technique of rearranging the material is similar to the Proto-Samaritan version and works with the introductory speech formula of Exod 20:22a. As in the case of Exod 20:21a and 21b, Exod 20:22 is also broken up and filled with new material. Thus, in SP the combination of quotations from Deut 5:28–31 and 18:18–22 is inserted between two speech formulae of Exod 20:22a by means of *Wiederaufnahme* (repetitive resumption). In 4Q158 this

(see n. 12), 64, who argues that the continuation of the text in frag. 7 presupposes the request for a mediator (frag. 6) beforehand.

⁴⁵ See STRUGNELL, “Notes” (see n. 15), 171; SEGAL, “Exegesis” (see n. 12), 56, n. 31.

⁴⁶ MT reads יהוה אל משה אל משה; 4Q158 frag. 6, line 4 reads לאמור ל'אמור; in accordance with SP and ויאמר יהוה אל משה; see BERNER, “Redaction History” (see n. 33), 390, n. 31. The Samaritan Pentateuch is quoted according to A. TAL and M. FLORENTIN (eds.), *The Pentateuch: The Samaritan Version and the Masoretic Version* (Tel-Aviv: The Haim Rubín Tel Aviv University Press, 2010).

⁴⁷ Here the reading agrees with MT: ויאמר יהוה אל משה (frags. 7–9, line 3).

⁴⁸ The beginning of Exod 20:22 is not preserved; according to the text of the Proto-Samaritan it can be restored as ויאמר יהוה אל משה לאמור as in frag. 6, line 4; see ZAHN, *Rethinking* (see n. 12), 252.

extension is supplemented by further additions, again using the speech formula of Exod 20:22a as a means of interpolation.

The differences are also significant with regard to the content. The main point is what the people saw and heard at Sinai and to what role Moses was assigned therein. The Proto-Samaritan version integrates Moses's review of the events at Horeb (Sinai) from Deut 5 into the scene of Exod 20:18–21 itself. This has the consequence that the people not only “see” (as in Exod 20:18) but also “hear.” Moreover, Moses is introduced as a mediator in much more detail than is the case in Exod 20:19. This also includes the announcement of a prophet according to Deut 18:18–22, which is connected with Deut 5, and the divine commission to Moses to let the people go, the execution of which, however, is not reported in the SP version.

4Q158 presupposes not the Masoretic composition but this version from the Proto-Samaritan and supplements it further.⁴⁹ The purpose is primarily to smooth transitions:

- A. In frag. 6, line 6, at the transition from Deut 5:29 to 18:18, the announcement of a prophet by means of a commission to Moses is introduced expressly and contextualized as a response to the people's request for a mediator (the source for the wording is Deut 18:16–17).
- B. In frags. 7–9, lines 3–5, at the transition from Deut 5:30–31 to Exod 20:22, it is reported that the people follow Moses's instructions and return to their tents before God continues to speak with Moses.
- C. Finally, the scene from Exod 20:18–21 (followed by Deut 5:24–31 and 18:18–22) is divided between the situation before (frag. 6) and after (frags. 7–9) the proclamation of the Decalogue. The transition from the Decalogue back to Deut 5:30–31 is made by means of *Wiederaufnahme* of the speech formula from Exod 20:22a, which here (in frags. 7–9, line 3) uses the wording attested in MT (וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל מֹשֶׁה); in frag. 6, line 4 and frags. 7–9, line 5, however, the wording of SP is used (וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל מֹשֶׁה לֵאמֹר).

The relocation of the Decalogue right after the interpolation of Deut 5 and 18 between Exod 20:21 and 22, is a *crux interpretum*. On the one hand, the quotation from Deut 5:24–27 in frag. 6 already says that the people not only “saw” something (Exod 20:18) but also “heard” God speak. On the other hand, the declaration of the Decalogue follows only afterward, in frags. 7–9.

Here, scholars usually follow the explanation of Michael Segal, who, on the basis of a later rabbinic tradition, suggests that before frag. 6 only the first two

⁴⁹ On the relative chronology and direction of dependence, see SEGAL, “Exegesis” (see n. 12), 56–57. The direction from Proto-Samaritan (attested in 4QpaleoExod^m and, apart from the Samaritan glosses, in the Samaritanus) to 4Q158 is also suggested by the clear tendency of extension in 4Q158.

commandments were proclaimed to the people and then afterward commandments 3–10 were proclaimed by Moses acting as mediator.⁵⁰ However, along with Christoph Berner, we have to bear in mind that this explanation cannot be proven on the basis of the text as it is preserved. Berner points out that the introduction of a speech addressed to Moses in line 3 of frags. 7–9 and the subsequent dismissal of the people can also suggest that the entire Decalogue was publicly proclaimed between frags. 6 and 7–9, before God turns to Moses, commissioning him to let the people go.⁵¹ There is, however, a third possibility, which was suggested by John Strugnell.⁵² He believed that, between frags. 6 and 7–9, both the proclamation of the prophet and the Decalogue were communicated first to Moses and then by Moses to the people, before God in frags. 7–9, line 3 gives the order to let the people go. The quotation from Deut 5:24–27 in frag. 6 would, in terms of Exod 20:18, only refer to the theophany and God’s speaking to Moses in Exod 19:9–19.

Following this last thought, i.e., an understanding of Deut 5:24–27 that implies that the people heard God’s voice but did not necessarily understand his words, I would like to propose yet another solution. We have to take into account that the whole interpolation between Exod 20:19b–21 and 20:20 is located and arranged by means of a *Wiederaufnahme* of the introductory speech formula in Exod 20:22a. Thus, the interpolation is most likely to be seen as a speech of God to Moses – in front of the people, who hear the voice but not necessarily the words. This fits very well with the narrative scene of Exod 19 and continues the back and forth of Moses, who is moving between God and the people. Here, too, the people see and hear that something is going on at the top of the mountain, but Moses must deliver the words of God to the people at the foot of the mountain.

However, there is one passage where the situation is confused, or at least unclear, namely, at the transition from Exod 19:25 to the Decalogue in 20:1. Here, Moses is still with the people at the foot of the mountain and speaks to them. The continuation in 20:1 can be read in two ways: (1) either God begins speaking to Moses and the people or (2) Moses is reproducing the words of God to the people. 4Q158 solved this problem by relocating the Decalogue to the speech of God to Moses starting in Exod 20:22. Thus, the conversation between Moses and the people introduced in Exod 19:25 continues in Exod 20:18–19b + Deut 5:24–27 + Exod 20:19b–21: this is before Moses, again, meets with God, and the conversation between God and Moses begins in Exod 20:22a – first with the people seeing and hearing but not necessarily understanding (Deut 5:28b–29 + Deut 18:18–22 + Decalogue + Deut 5:30–31), then without the people, who were sent home according to their wish and the commandment

⁵⁰ SEGAL, “Exegesis” (see n. 12), 57–58, followed by ZAHN, *Rethinking* (see n. 12), 66–67.

⁵¹ BERNER, “Redaction History” (see n. 33), 396–397.

⁵² STRUGNELL, “Notes” (see n. 15), 172–173; ZAHN, *Rethinking* (see n. 12), 67, n. 83.

of God to Moses. Although the people were still present and could hear (!), Moses had to deliver the message of God to the people (frags. 7–9, lines 3–5 + Exod 20:22–24).

In short, I think the sequence of the material is completely consistent if we apply the difference between “seeing and hearing” and “understanding” of Exod 19 to Deut 5:24–27, recognize the problem of the transition from Exod 19:25 to 20:1, and pay attention to the role of the speech introduction in Exod 20:22a for the whole rearrangement. Be that as it may, the arrangement of 4Q158 is in any case a (further) attempt to meaningfully integrate the different versions of the people’s reactions to the theophany and God’s speaking (either to them or to Moses) in Exod 20:18–21 and Deut 5:22–31, which the Proto-Samaritan version had already conflated.

These are the findings in 4Q158. What are their implications for the Masoretic Text and pentateuchal theory? In the case of the Sinai pericope, we are dealing with not just two but three versions (MT, SP, 4Q158) which are different but which did not evolve independently from each other. Whereas the Proto-Samaritan version appears to be a first revision of the older Proto-Masoretic Text of Exod 20, 4Q158 can be seen as a second revision.

The main tendency of the two revisions (SP and 4Q158) is, without any doubt, the harmonization of Exod 20 with Deut 5. However, the different ways of harmonizing reflect different conceptions of the role of Moses. If we did not have the intermediate version of the Proto-Samaritan text, we would ascribe all changes to 4Q158. If we only had the Proto-Samaritan version or only 4Q158 without the Masoretic Text, we would certainly not recognize every change but would still recognize one or the other, particularly in cases where there is the technique of *Wiederaufnahme*, which is used in both versions in order to integrate Deut 5 and 18 and the Decalogue.⁵³

This shows that we have to reckon with several intermediate textual versions in our analysis, some of which we will certainly miss but others that can be reconstructed by means of internal analysis. Although we are dealing here with the conflation of several sources (Exod 20 and Deut 5), the findings, seen individually, cannot be explained using the Source or Documentary Hypothesis but are best explained with the Fragmentary Hypothesis. However, since we know the Masoretic Text and an intermediate link (the Proto-Samaritan version), it is clear that we are dealing with a revision, which bears Exod 20 and Deut 5 in mind and is making an effort to harmonize both versions.

Let us now turn to the Masoretic Text itself.⁵⁴ The tendency to harmonize Exod 20 and Deut 5 can be observed here as well. It is immediately apparent that Deut 5 (vv. 22–31) offers not only a recapitulation but also an interpretation of the opening scene of the Covenant Code in Exod 20:18–21. If, in Exod 20, the

⁵³ See the chart above with nn. 46–48.

⁵⁴ For the following, see BERNER, “Redaction History” (see n. 33), 380–398.

people “saw” the theophany and the proclamation of the Decalogue, in Deut 5 they “saw” the theophany and “heard” the words of God spoken (v. 22–24). This, in itself, can be regarded as a first step to harmonize both passages.

The Deuteronomic conception of “seeing” and “hearing” also occurs in Deut 5:4. It is taken up in the Proto-Samaritan text and 4Q158, and in both versions is inserted into the scene of Exod 20 itself. By an addition to Deut 5:5, however, this concept is corrected to the effect that the Decalogue is only made known to the people through Moses as a mediator. A similar tendency can be observed in Exod 19:20–25 and possibly in the rearrangement of the scene before the proclamation of the Decalogue in 4Q158.

Taking a closer look, we can assume that the harmonization of Exod 20 and Deut 5 has taken shape gradually in the Masoretic version as well. Let us first have a look at Exod 20:18–21.

Exodus 20:18–21

וְכָל־הָעָם רֹאִים אֶת־הַקּוֹלֹת וְאֶת־הַלַּפִּידִים וְאֵת קוֹל הַשֹּׁפָר וְאֶת־הַהָר עֹשֵׂן וַיֵּרָא הָעָם וַיִּנְעוּ וַיַּעֲמֹדוּ
מֵרָחֵק :

וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֶל־מֹשֶׁה דַּבֵּר־אֵתָּה עִמָּנוּ וְנִשְׁמָעָה וְאַל־יְדַבֵּר עִמָּנוּ אֱלֹהִים פֶּן־נָמוּת :

וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל־הָעָם אֲלֵי־תִירְאוּ כִּי לִבְעֹבוֹר נְסוּת אֶתְכֶם בָּא הָאֱלֹהִים

וּבְעֹבוֹר תִּהְיֶה יְרֵאתוֹ עַל־פְּנֵיכֶם לְבַלְתִּי תִחְטְאוּ :

וַיַּעֲמֵד הָעָם מֵרָחֵק

וּמֹשֶׁה נִגַּשׁ אֶל־הָעֲרָפֶל אֲשֶׁר־שָׁם הָאֱלֹהִים :

All the people witnessed the thunder and lightning, the blare of the horn and the mountain smoking; and when the people saw it, they fell back and stood at a distance.

“You speak to us,” they said to Moses, “and we will obey; but let not God speak to us, lest we die.” Moses answered the people, “Be not afraid; for God has come only in order to test you, and in order that the fear of Him may be ever with you, so that you do not go astray.” So the people stood at a distance, and Moses approached the thick cloud where God was.

Exodus 20:19–21a are most probably an addition; this can be seen in the *Wiederaufnahme* of v. 18 (וַיַּעֲמֵדוּ מֵרָחֵק) in v. 21a (וַיַּעֲמֵד הָעָם מֵרָחֵק).⁵⁵ In the older layer, the people have “seen” the theophany and the Decalogue and move away (v. 18), whereas Moses again approaches God (v. 21b). Only in the later layer do the people ask Moses to serve as mediator (v. 19), and Moses says to the people “Do not be afraid” (v. 20). It can be assumed that the additions in vv. 19–20 are dependent on Deut 5:22–31, where the people “see” and “hear” and where the subject of Moses as mediator is dealt with in detail.

In addition, changes seem to have been made within Deut 5 itself in order to connect it with Exod 20. Deuteronomy 5:24–27 reads:

⁵⁵ See W. OSWALD, *Israel am Gottesberg: Eine Untersuchung zur Literargeschichte der vorderen Sinaiperikope Ex 19–24 und deren historischem Hintergrund* (OB 159; Freiburg, Switzerland: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1998), 98, 101, 258–259; BERNER, “Redaction History” (see n. 33), 381–383. The additions in Exod 20:19–21a may not be from a single hand: Oswald finds a later gloss in v. 20 and Berner in v. 19.

וַתֹּאמְרוּ הֵן הִרְאֵנוּ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֶת־כְּבוֹדוֹ וְאֶת־גְּדֻלּוֹ וְאֶת־קִלְוֵי שְׁמֵעֵנוּ מִתּוֹךְ הָאֵשׁ הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה
 רְאִינוּ כִּי־יִדְבֵר אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָדָם וְחַי :
 וְעַתָּה לָמָּה נָמוּת כִּי תֹאכְלֵנוּ הָאֵשׁ הַגְּדֹלָה הַזֹּאת
 אִם־יִסְפָּיִם אֲנַחְנוּ לְשִׁמְעַת אֶת־קוֹל יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ עוֹד וְנִמְתָּנוּ :
 כִּי מִי כִלְיֵשׁוּר אֲשֶׁר שָׁמַע קוֹל אֱלֹהִים חַיִּים מִדְּבַר מִתּוֹךְ־הָאֵשׁ כָּמוֹנוּ וְחַי :
 קָרַב אֲתָהּ וְשָׁמַע אֶת כָּל־אֲשֶׁר יֹאמַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְאֶת תְּדַבֵּר אֵלֵינוּ אֶת כָּל־אֲשֶׁר יִדְבַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ
 אֵלֶיךָ וְשָׁמַעְנוּ וְעָשִׂינוּ :

and you said, “YHWH our God has just shown us His majestic Presence, and we have heard His voice out of the fire;

we have seen this day that man may live though God has spoken to him.

Let us not die, then, for this fearsome fire will consume us;

if we hear the voice of YHWH our God any longer, we shall die.

For what mortal ever heard the voice of the living God speak out of the fire, as we did, and lived?

You go closer and hear all that YHWH our God says, and then you tell us everything that YHWH our God tells you, and we will willingly do it.”

Deuteronomy 5:24b–26 reflects the question under what circumstances humans can remain alive when hearing God. Thus, the people’s fear is ascribed both to the hearing of God’s words and to the danger of the fire of theophany. The reflection seems to be secondary, at least in some parts.⁵⁶ Perhaps its point of departure was v. 25b and the concern that listening to the voice of God would lead to death, which offers a reason for the distance in the original scene of Exod 19:18, 21b and justifies the request for Moses as mediator. In a second step, v. 25a (וְעַתָּה לָמָּה נָמוּת) introduced a further concern that if God’s speaking with a human being would not lead to death (v. 24b) then the fire might consume the people. Verse 26 is a *Wiederaufnahme* of v. 24b and combines both concerns. In any case, with the additions in vv. 24b–26, which are reflected in the additions in Exod 20:19–21a (פֶּן־נָמוּת אֱלֹהִים פֶּן־נָמוּת), a (further) bridge was constructed between Exod 20 and Deut 5.

Deuteronomy 5:29 ([...] מִיִּיתֶן וְהָיָה לְבָבְךָ זֶה לָהֶם לִירְאָה אֹתִי) is also an addition in the context of Deut 5:28–30.

Deuteronomy 5:28–30

וַיִּשְׁמַע יְהוָה אֶת־קוֹל דְּבָרֶיךָ בְּדַבְּרֶיךָ אֵלַי וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֵלַי שְׁמַעֲתִי אֶת־קוֹל דְּבָרֵי הָעָם הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר
 דִּבְרוּ אֵלַיךָ הִיטִיבוּ כָל־אֲשֶׁר דִּבְרוּ :
 מִיִּיתֶן וְהָיָה לְבָבְךָ זֶה לָהֶם לִירְאָה אֹתִי וְלִשְׁמֹר אֶת־כָּל־מִצְוֹתַי כְּלִי־יִמִּים לְמַעַן יִיטֵב לָהֶם וְלִבְנֵיהֶם לְעֹלָם :
 לֵךְ אָמַר לָהֶם שׁוּבוּ לְכֶם לְאֶהְלִיכֶם :

The LORD heard the plea that you made to me, and the LORD said to me, “I have heard the plea that this people made to you; they did well to speak thus.

May they always be of such mind, to revere Me and follow all My commandments, that it may go well with them and with their children forever!

Go, say to them, ‘Return to your tents.’”

⁵⁶ See T. VEIJOLA, *Das 5. Buch Mose: Deuteronomium Kapitel 1, 1–16, 17* (ATD 8/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 127, 136–137, 146–147; BERNER, “Redaction History” (see n. 33), 383–384, 386–387.

Verse 29 interrupts the connection between the self-commitment of the people and God's approval (vv. 27–28: הִיטִיבוּ כָּל-אֲשֶׁר דִּבְרוּ) and the dismissal of the people (vv. 30–31: לֹא-הָלִיכֶם לְאִמְרֵי לֵהֶם שׁוּבוּ לָכֶם לְאִמְרֵי יְהוָה).⁵⁷ The addition of v. 29 forms a link to Exod 20:20: God's intention to test the people and to bring them to fear God is fulfilled in Deut 5:29. Furthermore, the issue of fearing God is related to the admonition to keep the commandments in the future.

From these examples we can draw the conclusion that the beginnings of the development that we observed in the Proto-Samaritan version and in 4Q158 are to be found in the literary history of Exod 20 and Deut 5 themselves. The links between Exod 20 and Deut 5 are gradually added. They find their continuation in the integration of Deut 5 (including also Deut 18) into Exod 20 both in the Proto-Samaritan version and, finally, in 4Q158. This innerbiblical interpretation and harmonization cannot be explained either by the classical Documentary Hypothesis or by the Fragmentary Hypothesis but only by the supplementary or revisional approach. At first glance, it appears as if two independent sources (Exod 20 and Deut 5) were joined, especially if we consider the evidence in the Samaritan version and 4Q158.⁵⁸ Yet these two texts are already the result of innerbiblical interpretation, and they stand in a literary and compositional relationship with each other. The further revision in the Proto-Samaritan version and 4Q158 is just a continuation of this innerbiblical exegesis.

6 Textual Alterations

In addition to the three examples that we have discussed so far, in this section I would like to complete the analysis, focusing on the individual elements of the manuscript 4Q158, according to the three categories proposed by Molly Zahn in her work on 4QRP: minor additions, omissions, and paraphrases.⁵⁹

We have already discussed some of these issues above:

- A. The surplus in the blessing of Gen 32 in frags. 1–2, lines 7–10 partly recalls Gen 28:3 and 35:9–12 and partly features its own formulations – recognizable as an addition by *Wiederaufnahme*.
- B. The addition of a divine commission to communicate the announcement of the prophet like Moses (Deut 18:18) to the people in frag. 6, lines 5–6 is recognizable as an addition only if compared with the Masoretic Text.
- C. The introduction for the quotation from Deut 5:30–31 in frags. 7–9, line 3, owing to the rearrangement of Exod 20:18–21, became necessary as a transition from the proclamation of the Decalogue to the dismissal of the

⁵⁷ VEIJOLA, *Deuteronomium* (see n. 56), 127, 138, 144–145.

⁵⁸ Cf. TIGAY, “Empirical Basis” (see n. 3).

⁵⁹ See ZAHN, *Rethinking* (see n. 12), 35–37, 57–63; for the categories see 17–19.

people. This is recognizable as an addition because of the anticipation of the speech's opening from Exod 20:22a, which is likely to have been taken up again in line 5 (according to the Samaritan version).

- D. Certain additions produce a correspondence of commission and execution: in frags. 1–2, lines 12–13 (prohibition to eat the tendon of the sciatic nerve); frags. 1–2, lines 15–19 and frag. 4 (reproduction, partial paraphrase, new version of Exod 3:12, and the performance of worship according to the model of Exod 24); and frags. 7–9, lines 4–5 (dismissal and return of the people, recognizable as addition by *Wiederaufnahme*).

Two techniques stand out here: the method of *Wiederaufnahme* and the correspondence of commission and execution. Both techniques are found in 4Q158 as well as in the Masoretic Text. For the method of *Wiederaufnahme* we refer to Exod 20:18–21 and for the correspondence of commission and execution to the relationship of Exod 29:19–20 and Deut 5:22–31. Both techniques are widely used in the Hebrew Bible and in many cases point to later reworking. This is almost the consensus for the method of *Wiederaufnahme*; for the correspondence of commission and execution, we can refer to the Deuteronomistic notes on the fulfilment of prophetic predictions (for instance, in 2 Kgs 9, with regard to 1 Kgs 19 and 21) or to the Priestly writing and its account of the creation in Gen 1, the flood in Gen 6–9, or the building of the sanctuary in Exod 25–40, where this principle is applied on a grand scale. In all cases where these techniques are applied, reworking with or without comparison to the Masoretic Text can be seen.

However, the latter is not the case with the small changes and additions of one or two words that Zahn has listed for 4Q158, such as Gen 32:25a (וַיֵּתֶר וַיֵּצֵקֵב לְבָדוֹ) versus 4Q158 frags. 1–2, line 3 שמה [ל]ב [ל]עק[ב] י[ו]ת[ר] י[ו]ת[ר] י[ו]ת[ר], “And Jacob remained alone *there*.”⁶⁰ Even such small features are often significant and can smooth transitions or answer exegetical questions. Admittedly, in many cases these are purely stylistic or lexical variants, for which we cannot really determine the priority of one or the other variant. Unless they are strikingly different from the rest of the composition in terms of style, vocabulary, or grammar, such changes are almost impossible to identify without knowledge of a second textual witness. In these cases we find ourselves in an area where the borders between literary and textual history are particularly fluid.

Almost no omissions can be detected in 4Q158. Due to the length of the lines, Zahn suspects a possible case of haplography at two places (frag. 5, line 3; frags. 10–12, line 8).⁶¹ However, the available text does not indicate a deliberate omission anywhere. That we nevertheless have to reckon with this case is shown

⁶⁰ ZAHN, *Rethinking* (see n. 12), 35.

⁶¹ ZAHN, *Rethinking* (see n. 12), 57–58. Another possible shortening or omission is suggested by SEGAL, “Exegesis” (see n. 12), 49–50, n. 16 for the text of Exod 24:4–6 in frag. 4, lines 4–5.

by other examples where more text is available, such as the excerpts of Samuel–Kings in Chronicles. Without a second textual witness, however, this means of composition and reconstruction cannot be proven and should, therefore, be used only sparingly when formulating a theory.

It is equally difficult to reconstruct a *Vorlage* in cases of free paraphrasing. This is the case with 4Q158 in frag. 14 and also perhaps in frag. 3. The vocabulary in frag. 14 shows numerous points of contact with Exod 6:3–8 and Exod 15. The piece is possibly written in the context of Exod 6, as a proclamation of the victory over Egypt and the conquest of the promised land, which is described in Exod 15.⁶² In order to assess the extent to which we are dealing with a reworking and how to explain it, we need to have more text. The same is true for frag. 3, which may allude to Gen 49:1 or Gen 47:29–30.⁶³ Nevertheless, it is indisputable that we have to take free paraphrasing into account in the reworking process. In itself, such a paraphrase appears – depending on the circumstances – as original material, part of a source, as a fragment, or as a free, independent formulation. However, if the reference texts (here Exod 6 and 15) or the Masoretic version are known, then the paraphrase proves itself to be a reformulation and part of a revision.

7 Conclusion

Our subject in this paper was the possible implications of the 4QReworked Pentateuch manuscripts for the pentateuchal question. Looking in both directions, to 4Q158 as well as the Masoretic Text, I have to say that I cannot see any difference in their compositional strategies; on the contrary, I see a great similarity in terms of compositional techniques as well as content. As far as the Reworked Pentateuch manuscripts are concerned, we are dealing with “biblical” manuscripts, and so these texts are in every respect comparable to what we have in the Masoretic or the Samaritan Pentateuch. Even if we were to classify the Reworked Pentateuch manuscripts and the Samaritan Pentateuch as a kind of Rewritten Bible or Rewritten Scripture (the same sort of literature as, for example, Chronicles, Jubilees, the Temple Scroll, etc.), the comparability is given, not least since the Pentateuch itself seems to be a product of permanent rewriting of older traditions.

This result has, of course, enormous implications for the pentateuchal question and the different hypotheses to answer it. I see two primary implications: First, on the methodological level, the text is an example of various compositional techniques and models for how a text (at least a narrative text,

⁶² SEGAL, “Exegesis” (see n. 12), 54–55; ZAHN, *Rethinking* (see n. 12), 59–62.

⁶³ STRUGNELL, “Notes” (see n. 15), 170; SEGAL, “Exegesis” (see n. 12), 53–54; ZAHN, *Rethinking* (see n. 12), 62–63.

but I think also texts of other genres) has grown within the biblical tradition. Second, on the historical level, the Reworked Pentateuch manuscripts, like all other versions (MT, SP, LXX, Rewritten Bible), are witnesses of the same text and part of the same literary and textual history. They progress further along the path, which begins in the literary and redactional history of a biblical text and indicates the direction in which we must go to trace the history of extension, supplementation, and revision – in short, *Fortschreibung* – and exegesis of the Pentateuch. Here, as well as there, the Supplementary or Revisional Hypothesis (*Fortschreibungshypothese*) has proven itself an appropriate model that is superior in explanatory power to the Source or Documentary Hypothesis.